arXiv:1604.01041v1 [math.NT] 4 Apr 2016

PRIMES WITH RESTRICTED DIGITS

JAMES MAYNARD

Abstract. Let $a_0 \in \{0, \dots, 9\}$. We show there are infinitely many prime numbers which do not have the digit a_0 in their decimal expansion.

The proof is an application of the Hardy-Littlewood circle method to a binary problem, and rests on obtaining suitable 'Type I' and 'Type II' arithmetic information for use in Harman's sieve to control the minor arcs. This is obtained by decorrelating Diophantine conditions which dictate when the Fourier transform of the primes is large from digital conditions which dictate when the Fourier transform of numbers with restricted digits is large. These estimates rely on a combination of the geometry of numbers, the large sieve and moment estimates obtained by comparison with a Markov process.

1. Introduction

Let $a_0 \in \{0, \dots, 9\}$ and let

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \Big\{ \sum_{i \geq 0} n_i 10^i : n_i \in \{0, \dots, 9\} \backslash \{a_0\} \Big\}$$

be the set of numbers which have no digit equal to a_0 in their decimal expansion. The number of elements of $\mathcal{A}_1$ which are less than x is $O(x^{1-c})$, where $c = \log(10/9)/\log 10 \approx 0.046 > 0$. In particular, $\mathcal{A}_1$ is a sparse subset of the natural numbers. A set being sparse in this way presents several analytic difficulties if one tries to answer arithmetic questions such as whether the set contains infinitely many primes. Typically we can only show that sparse sets contain infinitely many primes when the set in question possesses some additional multiplicative structure.

The set $\mathcal{A}_1$ has unusually nice structure in that its Fourier transform has a convenient explicit analytic description, and is often unusually small in size. There has been much previous work [1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11] studying $\mathcal{A}_1$ and related sets by exploiting this Fourier structure. In particular the work of Dartyge and Mauduit [7, 8] shows the existence of infinitely many integers in $\mathcal{A}_1$ with at most 2 prime factors, this result relying on the fact that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is well-distributed in arithmetic progressions [7, 10, 15]. We also mention the related work of Mauduit-Rivat [16] who showed the sum of digits of primes was well-distributed, and the work of Bourgain [3] which showed the existence of primes in the sparse set created by prescribing a positive proportion of the binary digits.

We show that there are infinitely many primes in $\mathcal{A}_1$. Our proof is based on a combination of the circle method, Harman's sieve, the method of bilinear sums, the large sieve, the geometry of numbers and a comparison with a Markov process. In particular, we make key use of the Fourier structure of $\mathcal{A}_1$, in the same spirit as

the aforementioned works. Somewhat surprisingly, the Fourier structure allows us to successfully apply the circle method to a *binary* problem.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $X \geq 4$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{\sum_{i\geq 0} n_i 10^i < X : n_i \in \{0,\dots,9\}\backslash\{a_0\}\}$ be the set of numbers less than X with no digit in their decimal expansion equal to a_0. Then we have*

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\} \asymp \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} \asymp \frac{X^{\log 9/\log 10}}{\log X}.$$

Here, and throughout the paper, $f \asymp g$ means that there are absolute constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $c_1 f < g < c_2 f$.

Thus there are infinitely many primes with no digit a_0 when written in base 10. Since $\#\mathcal{A}/X^{\log 9/\log 10}$ oscillates as $X \to \infty$, we cannot expect an asymptotic formula of the form $(c+o(1))X^{\log 9/\log 10}/\log X$. Nonetheless, we expect that

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\} = (\kappa_2 + o(1))\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X},$$

where

$$\kappa_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{10(\phi(10)-1)}{9\phi(10)}, & \text{if } (10, a_0) = 1, \\ \frac{10}{9}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, there are $\phi(10)\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}/10$ elements of $\mathcal{A}$ which are coprime to 10, and there are $(1+o(1))X/\log X$ primes less than X which are coprime to 10. Thus if the properties 'being in $\mathcal{A}$' and 'being prime' where independent for integers $n < X$ coprime to 10, we would expect $(\kappa_2 + o(1))\#\mathcal{A}/\log X$ primes in $\mathcal{A}$. Theorem 1.1 shows this heuristic guess is within a constant factor of the truth, and we would be able to establish such an asymptotic formula if we had stronger 'Type II' information.

One can consider the same problem in bases other than 10, and with more than one excluded digit. The set of numbers less than X missing s digits in base q has $\asymp X^c$ elements, where $c = \log(q-s)/\log q$. For fixed s, the density becomes larger as q increases, and so the problem becomes easier. Our methods are not powerful enough to show the existence of infinitely many primes with two digits not appearing in their decimal expansion, but they can show that there are infinitely many primes with s digits excluded in base q provided q is large enough in terms of s. Moreover, if the set of excluded digits possesses some additional structure this can apply to very thin sets formed in this way.

Theorem 1.2. *Let q be sufficiently large, and let $X \geq q$.*

For any choice of $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{0,\dots,q-1\}$ with $\#\mathcal{B} = s \leq q^{23/80}$, let

$$\mathcal{A}' = \Big\{\sum_{i\geq 0} n_i q^i < X : n_i \in \{0,\dots,q-1\}\backslash\mathcal{B}\Big\}$$

be the set of integers less than X with no digit in base q in the set $\mathcal{B}$. Then we have

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}'\} \asymp \frac{X^{\log(q-s)/\log q}}{\log X}.$$

In the special case when $\mathcal{B} = \{0,\dots,s-1\}$ or $\mathcal{B} = \{q-s,\dots,q-1\}$, this holds in the wider range $0 \leq s \leq q - q^{57/80}$.

The final case of Theorem 1.2 when $\mathcal{B} = \{0, \dots, s-1\}$ and $s \approx q - q^{57/80}$ shows the existence many primes in a set of integers $\mathcal{A}'$ with $\#\mathcal{A}' \approx X^{57/80} = X^{0.7125}$, a rather thin set. The exponent here can be improved slightly with more effort.

The estimates in Theorem 1.2 can be improved to asymptotic formulae if we restrict s slightly further. For general $\mathcal{B}$ with $s = \#\mathcal{B} \leq q^{1/4-\delta}$ and any q sufficiently large in terms of $\delta > 0$ we obtain

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}'\} = (\kappa_{\mathcal{B}} + o(1))\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X},$$

where, if $\mathcal{B}$ contains exactly t elements coprime to q, we have

$$\kappa_{\mathcal{B}} = \frac{q(\phi(q)-t)}{\phi(q)(q-s)}.$$

In the case of just one excluded digit, we can obtain this asymptotic formula for $q \geq 12$. In the case of $\mathcal{B} = \{0, \dots, s-1\}$, we obtain the above asymptotic formula provided $s \leq q - q^{3/4+\delta}$.

We expect several of the techniques introduced in this paper might be useful more generally in other digit-related questions about arithmetic sequences. Our general approach to counting primes in $\mathcal{A}$ and our analysis of the minor arc contribution might also be of independent interest, with potential application to other questions on primes involving sets whose Fourier transform is unrelated to Diophantine properties of the argument.

2. Outline

Our argument is fundamentally based on an application of the circle method. Clearly for the purposes of Theorem 1.1 we can restrict to X a power of 10 for convenience. The number of primes in $\mathcal{A}$ is the number of solutions of the *binary* equation $p - a = 0$ over primes p and integers $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and so is given by

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\} = \frac{1}{X}\sum_{0 \leq a < X} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)S_{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big),$$

where

$$S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta) = \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} e(a\theta),$$
$$S_{\mathbb{P}}(\theta) = \sum_{p < X} e(p\theta).$$

We then separate the contribution from the a in the 'major arcs' which give our expected main term for $\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\}$, and the a in the 'minor arcs' which we bound for an error term.

The reader might be (justifiably) somewhat surprised by this, since it is well known that the circle method typically cannot be applied to binary problems. Indeed, one cannot generally hope for bounds better than 'square-root cancellation'

$$S_{\mathbb{P}}(\theta) \ll X^{1/2},$$
$$S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta) \ll \#\mathcal{A}^{1/2},$$

for 'generic' $\theta \in [0,1]$. Thus if one cannot exploit cancellation amongst the different terms in the minor arcs, we would expect that the $\gg X$ different 'generic' a in the sum above would contribute an error term which we can only bound as $O(X^{1/2}\#\mathcal{A}^{1/2})$, and this would dominate the expected main term.

It turns out that the Fourier transform $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta)$ has some somewhat remarkable features which cause it to typically have *better* than square-root cancellation. (A closely related phenomenon is present and crucial in the work of Mauduit and Rivat [16] and Bourgain [3].) Indeed, we establish the ℓ^1 bound

$$\sum_{0\leq a<X}\Big|S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\Big| \ll \#\mathcal{A}\, X^{0.36}. \tag{2.1}$$

which shows that for 'generic' a we have $S_{\mathcal{A}}(a/X) \ll \#\mathcal{A}/X^{0.64} \ll X^{0.32}$. This gives us a (small) amount of room for a possible successful application of the circle method , since now we might hope the 'generic' a would contribute a total $O(X^{0.82})$ if the bound $S_{\mathbb{P}}(a/X) \ll X^{1/2+\epsilon}$ held for all a in the minor arcs, and this $O(X^{0.82})$ error term is now smaller than the expected main term of size $\#\mathcal{A}^{1+o(1)}$.

We actually get good asymptotic control over all moments (including fractional ones) of $S_{\mathcal{A}}(a/X)$ rather than just the first. By making a suitable approximation to $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta)$, we can re-interpret moments of this approximation as the average probability of restricted paths in a Markov process, and obtain asymptotic estimates via a finite eigenvalue computation.

By combining an ℓ^2 bound for $S_{\mathbb{P}}(a/X)$ with an $\ell^{1.526}$ bound for $S_{\mathcal{A}}(a/X)$, we are able to show that it is indeed the case that 'generic' $a < X$ make a negligible contribution, and that we may restrict ourselves to $a \in \mathcal{E}$, some set of size $O(X^{0.36})$.

We expect that $S_{\mathbb{P}}(\theta)$ is large only when θ is close to a rational with small denominator, and $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta)$ is large when θ has a decimal expansion containing many 0's or 9's. Thus we expect the product to be large only when both of these conditions hold, which is essentially when θ is well approximated by a rational whose denominator is a small power of 10.

By obtaining suitable estimates for $\mathcal{A}$ in arithmetic progressions via the large sieve, one can verify that amongst all a in the major arcs $\mathcal{M}$ where a/X is well-approximated by a rational of small denominator we obtain our expected main term, and this comes from when a/X is well-approximated by a rational with denominator 10.

Thus we are left to show when $a \in \mathcal{E}$ and a/X is not close to a rational with small denominator, the product $S_{\mathcal{A}}(a/X)S_{\mathbb{P}}(-a/X)$ is small on average. By using an expansion of the indicator function of the primes as a sum of bilinear terms (similar to Vaughan's identity), we are led to bound expressions such as

$$\sum_{a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{E}\setminus\mathcal{M}}\Big|S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)\Big|\sum_{n_1,n_2\leq N}\min\Big(\frac{X}{N},\Big\|\frac{a_1n_1-a_2n_2}{X}\Big\|^{-1}\Big), \tag{2.2}$$

which is a generalized and averaged form of the typical expressions one encountering when obtaining a ℓ^∞ bound for exponential sums over primes. Here $\|\cdot\|$ is the distance to the nearest integer.

The double sum over n_1, n_2 in (2.2) is of size $O(N^2)$ for 'typical' pairs a_1, a_2, and if it is noticeably larger than this then (a_1, a_2) must share some Diophantine structure. We find that (a_1, a_2) must lie close to the projection from $\mathbb{Z}^3$ to $\mathbb{Z}^2$ of some low height plane or low height line if this quantity is large, where the arithmetic height of the line or plane is bounded by how large the double sum is. (For example, the diagonal terms $a_1 = a_2$ give a large contribution and lie on a low height line, and a_1, a_2 which are both small give a large contribution and lie in a low height plane.)

This restricts the number and nature of pairs (a_1, a_2) which can give a large contribution. Since we expect the size of $S_{\mathcal{A}}(a_1/X)S_{\mathcal{A}}(a_2/X)$ to be determined by digital rather than Diophantine conditions on a_1, a_2, we expect to have a smaller total contribution when restricted to these sets. By using the explicit description of such pairs (a_1, a_2) we succeed in obtaining such a superior bound on the sum over these pairs. It is vital here that we are restricted to a_1, a_2 lying in the small set $\mathcal{E}$ (for points on a line) and outside of the set $\mathcal{M}$ of major arcs (for points in a lattice).

This ultimately allows us to get suitable bounds for (2.2) provided $N \in [X^{0.36}, X^{0.425}]$. If this 'Type II range' were larger, we would be able to express the indicator function of the primes as a combination of such bilinear expressions and easily controlled terms. We would then obtain an asymptotic estimate for $\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Unfortunately our range is not large enough to do this. Instead we work with a minorant for the indicator function of the primes throughout our argument, which is chosen such that it is essentially a combination of bilinear expressions which do fall into this range. It is this feature which means we obtain a lower bound rather than an asymptotic estimate for the number of primes in $\mathcal{A}$.

Such a minorant is constructed via Harman's sieve, and, since it is essentially a combination of Type II terms and easily handled terms, we can obtain an asymptotic formula for elements of $\mathcal{A}$ weighed it. This gives a lower bound

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\} \geq (c + o(1))\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}$$

for some constant c. We use numerical integration to verify that we (just) have $c > 0$, and so we obtain our asymptotic lower bound for $\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\}$. The upper bound is a simple sieve estimate.

Remark. *For the method used to prove Theorem 1.1, strong assumptions such as the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis appear to be only of limited benefit. In particular, even under GRH one only gets pointwise bounds of the strength $S_{\mathbb{P}}(\theta) \ll X^{3/4+o(1)}$ for 'generic' θ, which is not strong enough to give a non-trivial minor arc bound on its own. The assumption of GRH and the above pointwise bound is sufficient to deal with the entire minor arc contribution in the regime where we obtain asymptotic formulae (i.e. when the base is sufficiently large).*

3. Notation

We use the asymptotic notation $\ll, \gg$, $O(\cdot)$ and $o(\cdot)$ throughout, denoting a dependence of the implied constant on a parameter t by a subscript. We let $f \asymp g$ to denote that both $f \ll g$ and $g \ll f$ hold. Throughout the paper ϵ will denote a

single fixed positive constant which is sufficiently small; $\epsilon = 10^{-100}$ would probably suffice. In particular, any implied constants may depend on ϵ. We will assume that X is always a suitably large integral power of 10 throughout.

Whenever we encounter the function F_Y we assume that Y is a positive integral power of 10. (Or that they are powers of q in Section 14.) We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the distance to the nearest integer, and $\|\cdot\|_2$ to denote the standard Euclidean norm. We use $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ for the indicator function of the set $\mathcal{A}$ of integers with restricted digits.

We need to make use of various numerical estimates throughout the paper, some of which succeed only by a small margin. We have endeavored to avoid too many explicit calculations and we encourage the reader to not pay too much attention to the numerical constants appearing on a first reading.

4. Fourier Estimates

In this section we collect various distributional bounds on the Fourier transform

$$S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta) = \sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}} e(a\theta)$$

which will underpin our later analysis. It will be convenient to normalize $S_{\mathcal{A}}$, and to be able to view it at different scales. With this in mind, we define

$$F_Y(\theta) = Y^{-\log 9/\log 10}\Big|\sum_{n<Y}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n)e(n\theta)\Big|,$$

so $F_Y(\theta) \ll 1$ for all θ and Y. We recall that we assume Y is an integral power of ten whenever we encounter F_Y to avoid some unimportant technical complications. The key property of F which we exploit is it has an exceptionally nice product form. If $Y = 10^k$, then letting $n = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} n_i 10^i$ have decimal digits $n_{k-1},\dots,n_0$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} F_Y(\theta) &= \frac{1}{9^k}\Big|\sum_{n_0,\dots,n_{k-1}\in\{0,\dots,9\}\setminus\{a_0\}} e\Big(\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} n_i 10^i\theta\Big)\Big| \\ &= \prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\Big|\frac{1}{9}\sum_{n_i<10}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n_i)e(n_i10^i\theta)\Big| \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^{k}\Big|\frac{e(10^i\theta)-1}{e(10^{i-1}\theta)-1} - e(a_010^{i-1}\theta)\Big|. \end{aligned}$$

We note that F_Y is periodic modulo 1, and that the above product formula gives the identity

$$F_{UV}(\theta) = F_U(\theta)F_V(U\theta).$$

(We recall that we assume that U and V are both powers of 10 in such a statement.)

Lemma 4.1 (ℓ^∞ bound)**.** *Let $q < Y^{1/3}$ be of the form $q = q_1q_2$ with $(q_1, 10) = 1$ and $q_1 > 1$, and let $|\eta| < Y^{-2/3}/2$. Then for any integer a coprime with q we have*

$$F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\eta\Big) \ll \exp\Big(-c\frac{\log Y}{\log q}\Big)$$

for some absolute constant $c > 0$.

Proof. We have that

$$|e(n\theta)+e((n+1)\theta)|^2 = 2+2\cos(2\pi\theta) < 4\exp(-2\|\theta\|^2).$$

This implies that

$$\Big|\sum_{n_i<10}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n_i)e(n_i\theta)\Big| \le 7+2\exp(-\|\theta\|^2) \le 9\exp\Big(-\frac{\|\theta\|^2}{10}\Big).$$

We substitute this bound into our expression for F_Y, which gives for $Y=10^k$

$$\begin{aligned} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}\Big) &= \prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\frac{1}{9}\Big|\sum_{n_i<q}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n_i)e(n_i10^it)\Big| \\ &\le \exp\Big(-\frac{1}{10}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1}\|10^it\|^2\Big). \end{aligned}$$

If $\|10^it\|<1/20$ then $\|10^{i+1}t\| = 10\|10^it\|$. If $t=a/q_1q_2$ with $q_1>1$, $(q_1,10)=1$ and $(a,q_1)=1$, then $\|10^it\|\ge 1/q$ for all i. Similarly, if $t=a/q_1q_2+\eta$ with a,q_1,q_2 as above $|\eta|<Y^{-2/3}/2$ and $q=q_1q_2<Y^{1/3}$ then for $i<k/3$ we have $\|10^it\|\ge 1/q-10^i|\eta|\ge 1/2q$. Thus, for any interval $\mathcal{I}\subseteq[0,k/3]$ of length $\log q/\log 10$, there must be some integer $i\in\mathcal{I}$ such that $\|10^i(a/q+\eta)\|>1/200$. This implies that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k}\Big\|10^i\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\eta\Big)\Big\|^2 \ge \frac{1}{10^5}\Big\lfloor\frac{\log Y}{3\log q}\Big\rfloor.$$

Substituting this into the bound for F, and recalling we assume $q<Y^{1/3}$ gives the result. □

Lemma 4.2 (Markov moment bound)**.** *Let J be a positive integer. Let $\lambda_{t,J}$ be the largest eigenvalue of the $10^J\times 10^J$ matrix M_t, given by*

$$(M_t)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} G(a_1,\dots,a_{J+1})^t, & \text{if } i-1=\sum_{\ell=1}^{J}a_{\ell+1}10^{\ell-1},\ j-1=\sum_{\ell=1}^{J}a_\ell 10^{\ell-1} \\ & \text{for some } a_1,\dots,a_{J+1}\in\{0,\dots 9\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where

$$G(t_0,\dots,t_J) = \sup_{|\gamma|\le 10^{-J-1}}\frac{1}{9}\Big|\frac{e(\sum_{j=0}^{J}t_j10^{-j}+10\gamma)-1}{e(\sum_{j=0}^{J}t_j10^{-j-1}+\gamma)-1} - e\Big(\sum_{j=0}^{J}\frac{a_0t_j}{10^{j+1}}+a_0\gamma\Big)\Big|.$$

Then we have that

$$\sum_{0\le a<10^k}F_{10^k}\Big(\frac{a}{10^k}\Big) \ll_{J,t} \lambda_{t,J}^k.$$

Proof. We recall the product formula with $Y=10^k$

$$F_Y(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^{k}\frac{1}{9}\Big|\frac{e(10^i\theta)-1}{e(10^{i-1}\theta)-1} - e(a_010^{i-1}\theta)\Big|,$$

where we interpret the term in parentheses as 9 if $\|10^{i-1}\theta\|=0$. Writing $\theta=\sum_{i=1}^{k}t_i10^{-i}$ for $t_i\in\{0,\dots,9\}$, we see that the $(k-j)^{th}$ term in the product depends only on $t_{k-j},\dots,t_k$. Moreover, the value of the term is mainly dependent on the first few of these digits. Thus we may approximate the absolute value

of $F_Y(\theta)$ by a product where the j^{th} term depends only on $t_j, \dots, t_{j+J}$ for some constant J. Explicitly, we have

$$F_Y\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{t_i}{10^i}\Big) \le \prod_{i=1}^k \sup_{|\gamma|\le 10^{-J-1}} \frac{1}{9}\Big|\frac{e(\sum_{j=0}^J \frac{t_{i+j}}{10^j}+10\gamma)-1}{e(\sum_{j=0}^J \frac{t_{i+j}}{10^{j+1}}+\gamma)-1} - e(a_0\sum_{j=0}^J \frac{t_{i+j}}{10^{j+1}}+a_0\gamma)\Big|$$
$$= \prod_{i=1}^k G(t_i,\dots,t_{i+J}),$$

where we put $t_j=0$ for $j>k$.

With this formulation we can interpret the above bound in terms of the probability of a walk on $\{0,\dots,9\}^k$. Consider an order-J Markov chain $X_1, X_2, \dots$ where for $a, a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0,\dots,9\}$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}(X_n = a | X_{n-i}=a_i \text{ for } 1\le i\le n) = cG(a,a_1,a_2,\dots,a_J)$$

for some suitably small constant c (so that the probability that $X_n \in \{0,\dots,9\}$ is less than 1). Then we have that

$$F_Y\Big(\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i}{10^{i-1}}\Big) \le c^{-k}\mathbb{P}(X_i=a_i \text{ for } 1\le i\le k).$$

The sum (over all paths of length k) of the probabilities of paths raised to the t^{th} power (for $t\in\mathbb{R}$) is a linear combination of the entries in the k^{th} power of the matrix formed by raising each entry of the transition matrix to the t^{th} power. Thus such a moment estimate is a linear combination of the k^{th} power of the eigenvalues of this matrix. This allows us to estimate any moment of $F_Y(a/Y)$ over $a\in[1,Y]$ uniformly for all k by performing a finite eigenvalue calculation. In particular, this gives us a (arbitrarily good as J increases) numerical approximation to the distribution function of F_Y.

Explicitly, let $\lambda_{t,J}$ be the absolute value of the largest eigenvalue of the $10^J\times 10^J$ transition matrix M_t given by the Lemma. Since $G(t_1,\dots,t_{J+1})>0$ for all $t_1,\dots,t_{J+1}$, we have that M_t is irreducible, and so each eigenspace corresponding to an eigenvalue of modulus λ_t has dimension 1 by the Perron-Frobenius theorem. Thus, recalling $Y=10^k$, we have

$$\sum_{0\le a<Y} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{Y}\Big)^t \le c^{-k}\sum_{\mathbf{a}\in\{0,\dots,9\}^k} \mathbb{P}(X_i=a_i \text{ for } 1\le i\le k)^t$$
$$= \sum_j (M_t^k)_{1,j}$$
$$\ll_{J,t} \lambda_{t,J}^k. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 4.3 (ℓ^1 bound)**.** *We have for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\{0,\dots,9\}^k}\prod_{i=1}^k G(t_i,\dots,t_{i+4}) \ll 10^{27k/77}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}}\sum_{a<Y} F_Y\Big(\beta+\frac{a}{Y}\Big) \ll Y^{27/77},$$

and

$$\int_0^1 F_Y(t)dt \ll \frac{1}{Y^{50/77}}.$$

Here $27/77 \approx 0.35$ is slightly larger than $1/3$, and $50/77 \approx 0.65$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.2 and a numerical bound on $\lambda_{1,4}$. Specifically, by Lemma 4.2 taking $J = 4$ we find

$$\sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\{0,\dots,9\}^k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} G(t_1,\dots,t_{1+J}) \leq \sum_j (M_1^k)_{1,j} \ll \lambda_{1,4}^k.$$

A numerical calculation[1] reveals that

$$\lambda_{1,4} < 2.24190 < 10^{27/77}$$

for all choices of $a_0 \in \{0,\dots,9\}$. This gives the first result. For the final bounds, we see that if $Y = 10^k$ and $\eta \ll Y^{-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} F_Y\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{t_i}{10^i} + \eta\Big) &\leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \Big(G(t_i,\dots,t_{i+J}) + O(10^i\eta)\Big) \\ &= (1 + O_J(Y\eta)) \prod_{i=1}^{k} G(t_i,\dots,t_{i+J}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we used the fact that $G(t_1,\dots,t_{J+1})$ is bounded away from 0 for all $t_1,\dots,t_{J+1} \in \{0,\dots,9\}^J$ since it is the maximal absolute value of a trigonometric polynomial over an interval. Since F is periodic modulo 1 we can restrict to $\beta \in [0, Y^{-1}]$, which then gives the second bound of the Lemma. For the final bound we integrate over $\eta \in [0, Y^{-1}]$ and sum over $t_1,\dots,t_u \in \{0,\dots,9\}$, giving

$$\int_0^1 F_Y(t)dt \ll Y^{-1} \sum_j (M_1^k)_{1,j} \ll \frac{1}{Y^{50/77}}. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 4.4 ($235/154^{th}$ moment bound)**.** *We have that*

$$\#\Big\{1 \leq a < Y : F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{Y}\Big) \asymp \frac{1}{B}\Big\} \ll B^{235/154} Y^{59/433}.$$

Here $235/154 \approx 1.5$ and $59/433 \approx 0.14$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.2 and a numerical bound for $\lambda_{235/154,4}$. Explicitly, we take $J = 4$ and $Y = 10^k$. By Lemma 4.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \#\Big\{0 \leq a < Y : F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{Y}\Big) \asymp \frac{1}{B}\Big\} &\leq B^{235/154} \sum_{0\leq a<Y} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{Y}\Big)^{235/154} \\ &\ll B^{235/154} \lambda_{235/154,4}^k. \end{aligned}$$

A numerical calculation[2] reveals that

$$\lambda_{235/154,4} < 1.36854 < 10^{59/433},$$

[1] A Mathematica® file detailing this computation is included with this article on `arxiv.org`.
[2] A Mathematica® file detailing this computation is included with this article on `arxiv.org`.

for all choices of $a_0 \in \{0, \dots, 9\}$. Substituting this in the bound above gives the result. □

Lemma 4.5 (Large sieve estimates)**.** *We have*

$$\sup_{q\le Q,\, \beta\in\mathbb{R}} \sum_{a\le q} \sup_{|\eta|\le 1/10Q} \Big|F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\beta+\eta\Big)\Big| \ll Q^{27/77} + \frac{Q}{Y^{50/77}},$$

$$\sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}} \sum_{q\le Q} \sum_{\substack{0<a<q\\(a,q)=1}} \sup_{|\eta|<1/10Q^2} \Big|F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\beta+\eta\Big)\Big| \ll Q^{54/77} + \frac{Q^2}{Y^{50/77}},$$

$$\sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}} \sum_{\substack{q\le Q\\ d|q}} \sum_{\substack{0<a<q\\(a,q)=1}} \sup_{|\eta|<1/10Q^2} \Big|F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\beta+\eta\Big)\Big| \ll \Big(\frac{Q^2}{d}\Big)^{27/77} + \frac{Q^2}{dY^{50/77}}.$$

Proof. We have that

$$F_U(t) = F_U(s) + \int_s^t F_U'(v)dv.$$

Thus integrating over $s \in [t-\gamma, t+\gamma]$ for some $\gamma > 0$, we have

$$|F_U(t)| \ll \frac{1}{\gamma}\int_{t-\gamma}^{t+\gamma} F_U(s)ds + \int_{t-\gamma}^{t+\gamma} |F_U'(s)|ds.$$

We note that for any choice of $|\eta_a| < 1/10Q$ for $a \le q$, the numbers $a/q + \eta_a$ are separated from one another by at least $1/2q \ge 1/2Q$. Thus, taking $\gamma = 1/2Q$, we obtain

$$\sum_{a\le q} \sup_{|\eta|<1/10Q} F_U\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\beta+\eta\Big) \ll Q\int_0^1 F_U(t)dt + \int_0^1 |F_U'(t)|dt.$$

Writing $U = 10^u$ and $n = \sum_{i=0}^{u-1} n_i 10^i$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_U'(t)| &= \frac{2\pi}{9^u}\Big|\sum_{n<10^u} n\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n)e(nt)\Big| \\
&= \frac{2\pi}{9^u}\sum_{j=0}^{u-1} 10^j \Big|\sum_{0\le n_j<10} n_j \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}} e(n_j 10^j t)\Big| \prod_{\substack{0\le i\le u-1\\ i\ne j}} \Big|\sum_{0\le n_i<10} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n_i)e(n_i 10^i t)\Big| \\
&\ll \frac{10^u}{9^u}\sup_{j\le u} \prod_{\substack{0\le i\le u-1\\ i\ne j}} \Big|\sum_{0\le n_i<10} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n_i)e(n_i 10^i t)\Big|.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, since $G(t_1, \dots, t_{1+J})$ is bounded away from 0, we see that for $\eta \ll U^{-1}$

$$\begin{aligned}
|F_U'\Big(\sum_{i=1}^u \frac{t_i}{10^i} + \eta\Big)| &\ll U\prod_{i=1}^u \Big(G(t_i, \dots, t_{i+J}) + O(10^i\eta)\Big) \\
&\ll (U + O(U^2\eta))\prod_{i=1}^u G(t_i, \dots, t_{i+J}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, integrating over $\eta \in [0, U^{-1}]$ and using Lemma 4.3, we obtain

$$\int_0^1 |F_U'(t)|dt \ll U \sum_{\mathbf{t}\in\{0,\dots,9\}^u} \prod_{i=1}^{u} G(t_i, \dots, t_{i+J}) \ll U^{27/77}.$$

This gives

$$\sum_{a\le q} \sup_{\eta<1/10Q} F_U\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\beta+\eta\Big) \ll U^{27/77} + \frac{Q}{U^{50/77}}.$$

Combining this with the trivial bound

$$F_Y(t) \le F_U(t)$$

for $U \le Y$, and choosing U maximally subject to $U \le Q$ and $U \le Y$ gives the result.

The other bounds follow from entirely analogous arguments. In particular we note that for any choice of $|\eta_{a,q}| < 1/10Q^2$ for $(a,q) = 1$, $q < Q$, the numbers $a/q + \eta_{a,q}$ are separated from one another by $\gg 1/Q^2$, and those with $d|q$ are separated from each other by $\gg d/Q^2$. □

Lemma 4.6 (Hybrid Bounds)**.** *Let $E \gg 1$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{a\le q} \sum_{\substack{\eta\ll E/Y \\ (\eta+a/q)Y\in\mathbb{Z}}} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\eta\Big) \ll (qE)^{27/77} + \frac{qE}{Y^{50/77}},$$

$$\sum_{\substack{q<Q \\ d|q}} \sum_{\substack{a\le q \\ (a,q)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\eta\ll E/Y \\ (\eta+a/q)Y\in\mathbb{Z}}} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\eta\Big) \ll \Big(\frac{Q^2E}{d}\Big)^{27/77} + \frac{Q^2E}{dY^{50/77}}.$$

Proof. We recall that for $U \le V$ we have

$$F_{UV}(\theta) = F_U(\theta)F_V(U\theta).$$

We also have the trivial bound $|F_U(\theta)| \ll 1$. For $UV \le Y$ these give

$$F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\eta\Big) \ll F_{Y/UV}\Big(\frac{UVa}{q}+UV\eta\Big) \sup_{\gamma\ll E/Y} F_U\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\gamma\Big).$$

We choose U and V to be powers of 10 such that $V \asymp \max(Y/qE, 1)$ and $U \asymp \max(Y/VE, 1)$ with $UV \le Y$. Thus

$$\sum_{a\le q} \sum_{\substack{\eta\ll E/Y \\ (\eta+a/q)Y\in\mathbb{Z}}} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\eta\Big) \ll \Sigma_1\Sigma_2,$$

where

$$\Sigma_1 = \sum_{a\le q} \sup_{\gamma\ll E/Y} F_U\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\gamma\Big),$$

$$\Sigma_2 = \sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}} \sum_{\substack{\eta\ll E/Y \\ Y(\eta+\beta)\in\mathbb{Z}}} F_{Y/UV}\Big(\beta+UV\eta\Big)$$

$$= \sup_{\beta'\in\mathbb{R}} \sum_{a\ll E} F_{Y/UV}\Big(\beta'+\frac{a}{Y/UV}\Big).$$

Since $U \ll q$, by Lemma 4.5 we have

$$\Sigma_1 \ll \frac{q}{U^{50/77}},$$

and since $Y/UV \ll E$, by Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\Sigma_2 \ll \frac{E}{(Y/UV)^{50/77}}.$$

Putting this together gives the first result.

The second bound follows from an entirely analogous argument using the final bound of Lemma 4.5 instead of the first bound. □

The first bound of Lemma 4.6 is essentially sharp if q is a divisor of a power of 10 or if $QE \gg Y$. When $QE \ll Y^{1-\epsilon}$ and q is not a divisor of a power of 10, however, we trivially bounded a factor $F_V(U(a/q+\eta))$ by 1 in the proof, which we expect not to be tight. Lemma 4.7 below allows us to obtain superior bounds (in certain ranges) provided the denominators do not have large powers of 2 or 5 dividing them.

Lemma 4.7 (Alternative Hybrid Bound)**.** *Let $q_1 \asymp Q_1$ with $(q_1, 10) = 1$ and $d|10^u$ for some $u \geq 0$ with $d \asymp D$. Let $DE \ll Y$, $E \gg 1$ and let*

$$S = S(d, q_1, Q_2, E, Y) = \sum_{\substack{q_2 \asymp Q_2 \\ (q_2,10)=1}} \sum_{\substack{a \leq dq_1q_2 \\ (a,dq_1q_2)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\eta \ll E/Y \\ (\eta + a/q_1q_2d)Y \in \mathbb{Z}}} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{dq_1q_2} + \eta\Big).$$

Then we have

$$S \ll (DE)^{27/77}(Q_1Q_2^2)^{1/21} + \frac{E^{5/6}D^{3/2}Q_1Q_2^2}{Y^{10/21}}.$$

In particular, if $q = dq'$ with $(q', 10) = 1$ and $d|10^u$ for some integer $u \geq 0$, then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{a \leq q \\ (a,q)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\eta \ll E/Y \\ (\eta + a/q)Y \in \mathbb{Z}}} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q} + \eta\Big) \ll (dE)^{27/77}q^{1/21} + \frac{qd^{1/2}E^{5/6}}{Y^{10/21}}.$$

For example, if $(q, 10) = 1$ and qE is a sufficiently small power of Y, then we improve the first bound $(qE)^{27/77}$ of Lemma 4.6 in the q-aspect to $E^{27/77}q^{1/21}$. This improvement is important for our later estimates.

Proof. We may clearly take D, E to be integral powers of 10. Let V be a integral power of 10 such that $V^2 \asymp Y/(DE)$ (this is possible since by assumption we have $DE \ll Y$). Let $d = d_1d_2d_3$ where $d_3 = (d, D)$ and $d_2d_3 = (d, VD)$. By the periodicity of F modulo one, the fact $(q_1q_2, d) = 1$, and the Chinese remainder theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{a \leq dq_1q_2 \\ (a,dq_1q_2)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\eta \ll E/Y \\ (\eta + a/q_1q_2d)Y \in \mathbb{Z}}} F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{dq_1q_2} + \eta\Big) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{a \leq q_1q_2 \\ (a,q_1q_2)=1}} \sum_{\substack{b_1 \leq d_1 \\ (b_1 + d_1b_2 + d_1d_2b_3, d)=1}} \sum_{b_2 \leq d_2} \sum_{b_3 \leq d_3} {\sum_{\eta \ll E/Y}}' F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q_1q_2} + \frac{b_1}{d_1d_2d_3} + \frac{b_2}{d_2d_3} + \frac{b_3}{d_3} + \eta\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

where the dash on $\sum'$ indicates that η is summed over all reals satisfying

$$\Big(\eta+\frac{a}{q_1q_2}+\frac{b_1}{d_1d_2d_3}+\frac{b_2}{d_2d_3}+\frac{b_3}{d_3}\Big)Y\in\mathbb{Z}.$$

Since F is periodic modulo 1, $F_{UV}(t)=F_U(t)F_V(Ut)$, and $d_3|D$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q_1q_2}+\frac{b_1}{d_1d_2d_3}+\frac{b_2}{d_2d_3}+\frac{b_3}{d_3}+\eta\Big)\\&\quad\ll F_E\Big(\beta_1+DV^2\eta\Big)\sup_{\gamma\ll E/Y}F_D\Big(\beta_2+\frac{b_3}{d_3}+\gamma\Big)F_{V^2}\Big(D\beta_2+D\gamma\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta_1=DV^2\Big(\frac{a}{q_1q_2}+\frac{b_1}{d_1d_2d_3}+\frac{b_2}{d_2d_3}+\frac{b_3}{d_3}\Big),\qquad \beta_2=\frac{a}{q_1q_2}+\frac{b_1}{d_1d_2d_3}+\frac{b_2}{d_2d_3}.$$

Moreover, by Cauchy-Schwarz we have

$$F_{V^2}(\theta)=F_V(\theta)F_V(V\theta)\ll F_V(\theta)^2+F_V(V\theta)^2.$$

Since $(d,VD)=d_2d_3$, this gives

$$F_{V^2}\Big(D\beta_2+D\gamma\Big)\le F_V\Big(D\beta_2+D\gamma\Big)^2+F_V\Big(\frac{DVa}{q_1q_2}+\frac{b_1(D/d_2d_3)}{d_1}+DV\gamma\Big)^2.$$

Using these bounds we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{q_2\asymp Q_2\\(q_2,10)=1}}\sum_{\substack{a\le dq_1q_2\\(a,dq_1q_2)=1}}\sum_{\substack{\eta\ll E/Y\\(\eta+a/dq_1q_2)Y\in\mathbb{Z}}}F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q_1q_2}+\frac{b}{d}+\eta\Big)\ll\Sigma_1(\Sigma_2\Sigma_3+\Sigma_4\Sigma_5),\tag{4.1}$$

where, letting $a_1=aDd_1d_2+(b_1+b_2d_1)q_1q_2D/b_3$ and $a_2=aDVd_1+b_1q_1q_2DV/(d_2d_3)$ and $b'=b_1+b_2d_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_1&=\sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}}\sum_{\substack{\eta\ll E/Y\\Y(\eta+\beta)\in\mathbb{Z}}}F_E\Big(\beta+UV^2\eta\Big),\\
\Sigma_2&=\sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}}\sum_{b_3\le d_3}\sup_{\gamma\ll E/Y}F_D\Big(\frac{b_3}{d_3}+\beta+\gamma\Big),\\
\Sigma_3&=\sum_{\substack{q_2\asymp Q_2\\(q_2,10)=1}}\sum_{\substack{a_1\le d_1d_2q_1q_2\\(a_1,d_1d_2q_1q_2)=1}}\sup_{\gamma\ll E/Y}F_V\Big(\frac{a_1}{d_1d_2q_1q_2}+D\gamma\Big)^2,\\
\Sigma_4&=\sup_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}}\sum_{b'\le d_2d_3}\sup_{\gamma\ll E/Y}F_D\Big(\frac{b'}{d_2d_3}+\beta+\gamma\Big),\\
\Sigma_5&=\sum_{q_2\asymp Q_2}\sum_{\substack{a_2\le d_1q_1q_2\\(a_2,d_1q_1q_2)=1}}\sup_{\gamma\ll E/Y}F_V\Big(\frac{a_2}{d_1q_1q_2}+DV\gamma\Big)^2.\end{aligned}$$

We have $d_2d_3\le d\ll D$, so by Lemma 4.5 we have

$$\Sigma_1\ll E^{27/77},\tag{4.2}$$

$$\Sigma_2\ll d_3^{27/77},\tag{4.3}$$

$$\Sigma_4\ll(d_2d_3)^{27/77}.\tag{4.4}$$

We are left to deal with the sums Σ_3 and Σ_5, and we note that Σ_5 is a special case of Σ_3 with $d_2=1$, so it suffices to consider Σ_3. Since $F_R(\theta)\le F_V(\theta)$ for $R\le V$, we may replace F_V with F_R where $R\asymp \min(V, d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2)$.

Given any choice of reals $\eta_{a,q_2}\ll 1/R$ for $a\le d_1d_2q_1q_2$ and $q_2\asymp Q_2$ with $(a,d_1d_2q_1q_2)=1$, the fractions $a/d_1d_2q_1q_2+\eta_{a,q_2}$ can be arranged into $O(1+d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2/R)$ sets such that all fractions in any set are separated by $\gg 1/d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2+1/R$. Thus, as in the proof of Lemma 4.5, we find that

$$\sum_{q_2\asymp Q_2}\sum_{\substack{a\le q_1q_2\\(a,q_1q_2)=1}}\sup_{|\eta|\ll 1/R}F_R\Big(\frac{a}{q_1q_2}+\eta\Big)^2\ll d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2\int_0^1F_R(t)^2dt + \Big(1+\frac{d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2}{R}\Big)\int_0^1|F_R'(t)|F_R(t)dt.$$

By Parseval we have

$$\int_0^1F_R(t)^2dt=\frac{1}{9^{2r}}\sum_{\substack{a\in\mathcal{A}\\a\le R}}1=\frac{1}{9^r},$$

and

$$\int_0^1F_R'(t)^2dt=\frac{1}{9^{2r}}\sum_{\substack{a\in\mathcal{A}\\a\le R}}4\pi^2a^2\ll\frac{10^{2r}}{9^r}.$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz and the above bounds, we obtain

$$\int_0^1|F_R'(t)|F_R(t)dt\ll\Big(\int_0^1F_R'(t)^2dt\Big)^{1/2}\Big(\int_0^1F_R(t)^2dt\Big)\ll\frac{10^r}{9^r}.$$

Putting this together gives

$$\Sigma_3\ll\frac{d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2+10^r}{9^r}.$$

We recall that $R=10^r\asymp\min(V,d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2)$, that $V\asymp(Y/DE)^{1/2}$ and note that $20/21<\log 9/\log 10$. This gives

$$\Sigma_3\ll(d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2)^{1/21}+d_1d_2Q_1Q_2^2\Big(\frac{Y}{DE}\Big)^{-10/21}. \tag{4.5}$$

We obtain an equivalent bound for Σ_5 with d_2 replaced by 1. Combining (4.5) with our earlier bounds (4.2), (4.3) and (4.4) and substituting these into (4.1) gives

$$\sum_{a\le q}\sum_{\substack{\eta\ll E/Y\\(\eta+a/q)Y\in\mathbb{Z}}}F_Y\Big(\frac{a}{q}+\eta\Big)\ll E^{27/77}\Big(D^{27/77}(Q_1Q_2^2)^{1/21}+Q_1Q_2^2D\Big(\frac{Y}{DE}\Big)^{-10/21}\Big).$$

Simplifying the exponents by noting $1+10/21<3/2$ and $27/77+10/21<5/6$ then gives the result.

The second statement of the Lemma is simply the case when $Q_2=1$ and $q=dq_1$. □

5. Type I estimate

In this section we establish our 'Type I' estimate, which describes the number of elements of $\mathcal{A}$ in arithmetic progressions to modulus up to $X^{50/77-\epsilon} \approx X^{0.65}$ on average.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $A > 0$ and $Q \ll X^{50/77}(\log X)^{-2A}$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{q<Q\\(q,10)=1}} \Big|\#\{a\in\mathcal{A}:\, q|a,\,(a,10)=1\} - \kappa\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{q}\Big| \ll_A \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^A},$$

where

$$\kappa = \begin{cases} \frac{\phi(10)}{9}, & \text{if } (a_0,10)\neq 1,\\ \frac{\phi(10)-1}{9}, & \text{if } (a_0,10)=1.\end{cases}$$

Proof. By Möbius inversion and using additive characters, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\#\mathcal{A}'_q = \#\{a\in\mathcal{A}:\, q|a,\,(a,10)=1\} &= \sum_{d|10}\mu(d)\sum_{\substack{a\in\mathcal{A}\\ dq|a}} 1\\
&= \sum_{d|10}\mu(d)\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{1}{dq}\sum_{0\le b<dq} e\Big(\frac{ab}{dq}\Big)\Big)\\
&= \sum_{d|10}\frac{\mu(d)}{dq}\sum_{1\le b\le dq} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{b}{dq}\Big)\\
&= \sum_{d|10}\frac{\mu(d)}{dq}\sum_{1\le b\le d} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{b}{d}\Big) + O\Big(\sum_{d|10}\sum_{\substack{q'|q\\ q'>1}}\sum_{\substack{1\le b\le dq'\\ (b,dq')=1}}\frac{1}{q}\Big|S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{b}{dq'}\Big)\Big|\Big)\\
&= \frac{1}{q}\#\{a\in\mathcal{A}:(a,10)=1\} + O\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{q}\sum_{\substack{q'|q\\ q'>1}}\sum_{\substack{1\le b\le 10q'\\ (b,q')=1}} F_X\Big(\frac{b}{10q'}\Big)\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $\#\{a\in\mathcal{A}:(a,10)=1\} = \kappa\#\mathcal{A}$. Summing over $q<Q$ and letting $q=q'q''$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{q<Q\\(q,10)=1}}\Big|\#\mathcal{A}'_q - \frac{\kappa\#\mathcal{A}}{q}\Big| &\ll \sum_{\substack{q<Q\\(q,10)=1}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{q}\sum_{\substack{q'|q\\ q'>1}}\sum_{\substack{1\le b\le 10q'\\ (b,10q')=1}} F_X\Big(\frac{b}{10q'}\Big)\Big)\\
&\ll \sum_{\substack{q'<Q\\(q',10)=1}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{q'}\sum_{\substack{1\le b\le 10q'\\ (b,q')=1}} F_X\Big(\frac{b}{10q'}\Big)\sum_{q''<Q/q'}\frac{1}{q''}\\
&\ll \#\mathcal{A}(\log X)^2\sup_{Q_1\le Q}\frac{1}{Q_1}\sum_{\substack{1<q'\asymp Q_1\\(q',10)=1}}\sum_{(b,q')=1} F_X\Big(\frac{b}{10q'}\Big). \qquad (5.1)
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.5 we have

$$\frac{1}{Q_1}\sum_{q\asymp Q_1}\sum_{(a,q)=1} F_X\Big(\frac{a}{10q}\Big) \ll \frac{1}{Q_1^{50/77}} + \frac{Q_1}{X^{50/77}},$$

which gives the required bound if $Q_1 > (\log X)^{2A+4}$ on recalling that $Q_1 \le Q \ll X^{50/77}(\log X)^{-2A}$. In the case $Q_1 \le (\log X)^{2A+4}$ we instead use Lemma 4.1, which gives

$$\frac{1}{Q_1}\sum_{\substack{q\asymp Q_1\\(q,10)=1\\q>1}}\sum_{(a,q)=1}F_X\Big(\frac{a}{10q}\Big)\ll Q_1\sup_{\substack{(a,q)=1\\1<q\ll Q_1\\(q,10)=1}}F_X\Big(\frac{a}{10q}\Big)\ll_A\frac{Q_1}{(\log X)^{4A+8}}.$$

Thus we see that the bound (5.1) is $O(\#\mathcal{A}/(\log X)^A)$ in either case, as required. □

6. Type II estimate

In this section we reduce our 'Type II' estimate to various major arc and minor arc estimates. Our Type II estimate allows us to count integers in $\mathcal{A}$ with a specific type of prime factorization provided such numbers always have a 'conveniently sized' factor.

Proposition 6.1 (Type II estimate)**.** *Let $\eta > 0$, and let $\ell_1 \le \ell \ll \eta^{-1}$ be positive integers. Let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq [\eta, 1]^\ell$ be a convex polytope in $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ which is independent of X and which has the property that*

$$\mathbf{e}\in\mathcal{R}\Rightarrow\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_1}e_i\in\Big[\frac{9}{25}+\epsilon,\frac{17}{40}-\epsilon\Big].$$

Let

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(a)=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } a=p_1\dots p_\ell \text{ with } \Big(\frac{\log p_1}{\log X},\dots,\frac{\log p_\ell}{\log X}\Big)\in\mathcal{R},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(a)=\kappa_2\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(n)+O_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X\log\log X}\Big),$$

where

$$\kappa_2=\begin{cases}\frac{10(\phi(10)-1)}{9\phi(10)}, & \text{if } (10,a_0)=1,\\ \frac{10}{9}, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

We caution that $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}$ counts numbers with a particular type of prime factorization, and should not be confused with $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$, the indicator function of the set $\mathcal{A}$.

To avoid technical issues due to the fact that both $\sum_{n<Y}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(n)$ and $\sum_{a<Y}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n)$ can fluctuate with Y, we count integers with a weight $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}$ instead of $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}$, where

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n)=\sum_{\substack{p_1\dots p_\ell=n\\(\frac{\log p_1}{\log X},\dots,\frac{\log p_\ell}{\log X})\in\mathcal{R}}}\prod_{i=1}^{\ell}\log p_i.$$

We prove Proposition 6.1 by an application of the Hardy-Littlewood circle method, whereby we study the functions

$$S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta)=\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}e(a\theta),\qquad S_{\mathcal{R}}(\theta)=\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n)e(n\theta).$$

Proposition 6.1 then relies on the following three components.

Proposition 6.2 (Major arcs)**.** *Let $\delta = (\log\log X)^{-1}$, and let $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(a_1, \dots, a_{\ell-1})$ be given by*

$$\mathcal{R} = \Big\{\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^\ell : e_i \in [a_i, a_i + \delta^2] \text{ for } 1 \le i \le \ell - 1, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e_i \in [1-\delta, 1]\Big\},$$

for some constants $a_1, \dots, a_{\ell-1}$ satisfying $\min_i(a_i) \ge \eta/2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} a_i < 1 - \eta/2$ and $\ell \ll_\eta 1$.

Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(C)$ be given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \Big\{0 \le a < X : \frac{a}{X} = \frac{b}{q} + O\Big(\frac{(\log X)^C}{X}\Big) \text{ for some } q \ll (\log X)^C\Big\}.$$

Then

$$\frac{1}{X}\sum_{\substack{0\le a<X\\ a\in\mathcal{M}}} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big) = \kappa_2 \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(b) + O_{C,\eta}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^C}\Big).$$

Here κ_2 is the constant given in Proposition 6.1.

Proposition 6.3 (Generic minor arcs)**.** *Let $\ell \ll_\eta 1$ and $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^\ell$ be a convex polytope. There is some exceptional set $\mathcal{E} \subseteq [1, X]$ with*

$$\#\mathcal{E} \ll X^{23/40},$$

such that

$$\frac{1}{X}\sum_{\substack{a<X\\ a\notin\mathcal{E}}} |S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big)| \ll_\eta \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X^\epsilon}.$$

Proposition 6.4 (Exceptional minor arcs)**.** *Let η, ℓ, $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(a_1, \dots, a_{\ell-1})$ and $\mathcal{M}(C)$ be as given in Proposition 6.2. Let $a_1, \dots, a_{\ell-1}$ in the definition of $\mathcal{R}$ satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_1} a_i \in [9/25+\epsilon, 17/40-\epsilon]$ for some $\ell_1 < \ell$, and let $C = C(A, \eta)$ in the definition of $\mathcal{M}$ be sufficiently large in terms of A and η. Let $\mathcal{E} \subseteq [1, X]$ be any set such that $\#\mathcal{E} \ll X^{23/40}$. Then we have*

$$\frac{1}{X}\sum_{\substack{a\in\mathcal{E}\\ a\notin\mathcal{M}}} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big) \ll_\eta \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^A}.$$

Proof of Proposition 6.1 assuming Propositions 6.2, 6.3, 6.4. Let $\delta = (\log\log X)^{-1}$. Since $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(n) \le 1$, we have the trivial bounds

$$\sum_{n<X^{1-\delta}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(n) \le X^{1-\delta}, \qquad \sum_{\substack{a\in\mathcal{A}\\ a<X^{1-\delta}}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(a) \ll \#\mathcal{A}^{1-\delta}.$$

Thus it suffices to show the result for $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R} \cap \{\mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{R}^\ell : 1 - \delta \le \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} e_i \le 1\}$.

Let $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ be the projection of $\mathcal{R}'$ onto the first $\ell - 1$ coordinates, and let $\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ be given by

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta) = \Big\{\mathbf{e} \in [\eta, 1]^{\ell-1} : \{\mathbf{e}\} \times \Big[1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} e_i - \delta, 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} e_i\Big] \subseteq \mathcal{R}\Big\}.$$

(i.e. $\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ are those vectors in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ which have maximal length fibers.) Since $\mathcal{R}$ is a convex polytope, $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ are also a convex polytopes. Moreover, since $\mathcal{R}$ is independent of X, if $\mathbf{e}\in\overline{\mathcal{R}}\backslash\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ then $\mathbf{e}$ is within $O_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ of the boundary of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$.

We split $[\eta,1]^{\ell-1}$ into $O(\delta^{-(2\ell-2)})$ disjoint hypercubes of side length δ^2. By the prime number theorem, for any such hypercube $\mathcal{C}$, we have

$$\sum_{n<X}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}\times[\eta,1]}(n)\le\sum_{\substack{mp<X\\ p>X^{\eta}}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(m)\ll\sum_{m<X}\frac{X\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}(m)}{\eta m\log X}\ll_{\eta}\frac{\delta^{2\ell-2}X}{\log X}. \tag{6.1}$$

Given such a hypercube $\mathcal{C}$, let $\mathcal{C}^+\subseteq\mathbb{R}^{\ell}$ be given by

$$\mathcal{C}^+=\Big(\mathcal{C}\times[0,1]\Big)\cap\Big\{\mathbf{e}:1-\delta\le\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}e_i\le 1\Big\}.$$

We can minorize $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(a)$ by a sum over $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}^+}(a)$ over all cubes $\mathcal{C}$ fully contained in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)$, and we can majorize $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(n)$ by using all cubes which intersect $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$. This gives us the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(a)-\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(n)&\ge\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C}\\ \mathcal{C}\subseteq\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)}}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}^+}(a)-\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C}\\ \mathcal{C}\cap\overline{\mathcal{R}}\neq\emptyset}}\sum_{n<X}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}^+}(n)\\ &=\sum_{\mathcal{C}\subseteq\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)}\Big(\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}^+}(a)-\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}^+}(n)\Big)-\sum_{\substack{\mathcal{C}\not\subseteq\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)\\ \mathcal{C}\cap\overline{\mathcal{R}}\neq\emptyset}}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}^+}(n).\end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

We obtain an analogous upper bound by majorizing $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(a)$ and minorizing $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}'}(n)$. By (6.1), we see that the final term representing the contribution from the $O_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta^{-(2\ell-3)})$ hypercubes $\mathcal{C}$ with $\mathcal{C}$ intersecting $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ but not contained in $\overline{\mathcal{R}}(\delta)$ is of size $O_{\mathcal{R}}(\delta X/\log X)$.

Similarly, the $O_{\eta}(\delta^{(2-\ell-4)})$ hypercubes for which there is an integer n with multiple representations $n=p_1\dots p_{\ell}$ with $(\log p_i/\log X,\dots,\log p_{\ell}/\log X)\in\mathcal{C}^+$ contribute $O_{\eta}(\delta X/\log X)$.

For any remaining hypercube $\mathcal{C}=[e_1,e_1+\delta^2]\times\cdots\times[e_{\ell-1},e_{\ell-1}+\delta^2]$ under consideration, we see that

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}^+}(n)=\frac{(1+O_{\eta}(\delta))\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^+}(n)}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell}e_i\log X}. \tag{6.3}$$

Thus, combining (6.1), (6.2) and (6.3), we find that to establish Proposition 6.1, it is sufficient to show that for any $A>0$, we have

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^+}(a)=\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^+}(n)+O_{A,\eta}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^A}\Big),$$

for every hypercube $\mathcal{C}$ of side length δ^2 satisfying

$$\mathcal{C}\subseteq\Big\{\mathbf{e}\in[\eta/2,1]^{\ell-1}:\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1}e_i\le 1-\frac{\eta}{2},\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_1}e_i\in\Big[\frac{9}{25}+\frac{\epsilon}{2},\frac{17}{40}-\frac{\epsilon}{2}\Big]\Big\}.$$

By Fourier expansion we have

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^+}(a)=\frac{1}{X}\sum_{0\le b<X}S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{b}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{C}^+}\Big(\frac{-b}{X}\Big),$$

We split the summation over b into the sets $\mathcal{M}$, $[1,X]\backslash\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{E}\backslash\mathcal{M}$, and apply Propositions 6.2 6.3 and 6.4 respectively to each term. We let $H_{\mathcal{C}^+}(\theta) = S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta)S_{\mathcal{C}^+}(-\theta)$. For C in the definition of $\mathcal{M}$ sufficiently large in terms of A and η, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^+}(a) &= \frac{1}{X}\sum_{b\in\mathcal{M}}H_{\mathcal{C}^+}\Big(\frac{b}{X}\Big)+\frac{1}{X}\sum_{b\notin\mathcal{E}}H_{\mathcal{C}^+}\Big(\frac{b}{X}\Big)+\frac{1}{X}\sum_{\substack{b\in\mathcal{E}\\ a\notin\mathcal{M}}}H_{\mathcal{C}^+}\Big(\frac{b}{X}\Big)\\ &= \kappa_2\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}^+}(n)+O_{A,\eta}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^A}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

7. Major arcs

In this section we establish Proposition 6.2 using the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions and short intervals.

Proof of Proposition 6.2. We split $\mathcal{M}$ up as three disjoint sets

$$\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1\cup\mathcal{M}_2\cup\mathcal{M}_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{M}_1 &= \Big\{a\in\mathcal{M}:\frac{a}{X}=\frac{b}{q}+O\Big(\frac{(\log X)^C}{X}\Big)\text{ for some }\ q\ll(\log X)^C,\ q\nmid X\Big\},\\ \mathcal{M}_2 &= \Big\{a\in\mathcal{M}:\frac{a}{X}=\frac{b}{q}+\nu\text{ for some }\ q\ll(\log X)^C,\ q|X,\ 0<\nu\ll\frac{(\log X)^C}{X}\Big\},\\ \mathcal{M}_3 &= \Big\{a\in\mathcal{M}:\frac{a}{X}=\frac{b}{q}\text{ for some }\ q\ll(\log X)^C,\ q|X\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1, recalling $X=10^x$, we have

$$\sup_{a\in\mathcal{M}_1}S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) = \#\mathcal{A}\sup_{a\in\mathcal{M}_1}F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\ll\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^{3C}}.$$

Using the trivial bound $S_{\mathcal{R}}(\theta)\ll_\eta X$, and noting $\#\mathcal{M}\ll(\log X)^{2C}$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{X}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{M}_1}S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big)\ll_{C,\eta}\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^C}. \tag{7.1}$$

We have that

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n) = \sum_{\substack{pm=n\\ X^{1-\delta}/m\le p<X/m}}\Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(m)\log p,$$

where $\mathcal{C}=[a_1,a_1+\delta^2]\times\cdots\times[a_{\ell-1},a_{\ell-1}+\delta^2]$ is the projection of $\mathcal{R}$ onto the first $\ell-1$ coordinates. Thus, by the prime number theorem in short intervals and

arithmetic progressions, we have

$$\sup_{a\in\mathcal{M}_2} S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) = \sup_{a\in\mathcal{M}_2} \sum_{m<X^{1-\eta/2}} \Lambda_{\mathcal{C}}(m) \sum_{X^{1-\delta}/m\le p<X/m} (\log p) e\Big(\frac{amp}{X}\Big)$$
$$\ll_{C,\eta} \frac{X}{(\log X)^{3C}}.$$

Here it was important that we are counting elements with weight $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n)$ rather than $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(n)$, and that $X\nu\in\mathbb{Z}$ for $a\in\mathcal{M}_2$. Thus, using the trivial bound $S_{\mathcal{A}}(\theta)\le \#\mathcal{A}$, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{X}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{M}_2} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big) \ll_{C,\eta} \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^C}. \tag{7.2}$$

By the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions, we have for $(a,q)=1$ and $q\ll (\log X)^C$ that

$$S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{a}{q}\Big) = \frac{\mu(q)}{\phi(q)}\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n) + O_{\eta,C}\Big(\frac{X}{(\log X)^{3C}}\Big).$$

Since $\mu(q)=0$ for $q|10^x=X$ unless $q\in\{1,2,5,10\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{X}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{M}_3} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big) &= \frac{1}{X}\sum_{0\le b<10} S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{b}{10}\Big)S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-b}{10}\Big) + O_{C,\eta}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^C}\Big)\\ &= \frac{10}{\phi(10)}\Big(\frac{1}{X}\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n)\Big)\#\{a\in\mathcal{A}: (a,10)=1\} + O_{C,\eta}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^C}\Big)\\ &= \kappa_2\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n) + O_{C,\eta}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^C}\Big). \end{aligned}\tag{7.3}$$

Combining (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3) gives the result. □

Remark. *We have only appealed to the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions when the modulus is a small divisor of X. This means that our implied constants are effectively computable since for such moduli we do not need to appeal to Siegel's theorem.*

8. Generic minor arcs

In this section we establish Proposition 6.3 and obtain some bounds on the exceptional set $\mathcal{E}$ by using the distributional estimates of Section 4.

Lemma 8.1 (ℓ^2 bound for primes)**.** *We have that*

$$\#\Big\{1\le a<X: \Big|S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\Big| \asymp \frac{X}{C}\Big\} \ll C^2(\log X)^{O_\eta(1)}.$$

Proof. This follows from the ℓ^2 bound coming from Parseval's identity.

$$\begin{aligned}\#\Big\{1 \le a < X : \Big|S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\Big| \ge \frac{X}{C}\Big\} &\ll \frac{C^2}{X}\sum_{a<X}\Big|S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\Big|^2 \\ &= \frac{C^2}{X}\sum_{n<X}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n)^2 \\ &\ll C^2(\log X)^{O_\eta(1)}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 8.2 (Generic frequency bounds)**.** *Let*

$$\mathcal{E} = \Big\{1 \le a < X : F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) \ge \frac{1}{X^{23/80}}\Big\}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}\#\mathcal{E} &\ll X^{23/40-\epsilon}, \\ \sum_{a\in\mathcal{E}} F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) &\ll X^{23/80-\epsilon},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{X}\sum_{\substack{a<X\\ a\notin\mathcal{E}}}\Big|F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big)\Big| \ll_\eta \frac{1}{X^\epsilon}.$$

Proof. The first two bounds follow from Lemma 4.4. The size of $\mathcal{E}$ follows immediately taking $B = X^{23/80-\epsilon}$ and verifying that $(23\times 235)/(80\times 154) + 59/433 < 23/40$. For the second bound we see that

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{E}} F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) \ll \frac{B^{235/154}}{X^{23/80}}\sum_{a\in\mathcal{E}} F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)^{235/154} \ll \frac{B^{235/154}X^{59/433}}{X^{23/80}},$$

and so the calculation above gives the result.

It remains to bound the sum over a. We divide the sum into $O(\log X)^2$ subsums where we restrict to those a such that $F_X(a/X) \asymp 1/B$ and $|S_{\mathcal{R}}(a/X)| \asymp X/C$ for some $B \gg X^{23/80}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{X}\sum_{\substack{a<X\\ a\notin\mathcal{E}}}\Big|F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big)\Big| \\ &\qquad\ll \sup_{\substack{X^{23/80}\le B\\ 1\le C\le X}}\frac{(\log X)^{O_\eta(1)}}{X}\sum_{\substack{a<X\\ F_X(a/X)\asymp 1/B\\ S_{\mathcal{R}}(-a/X)\asymp X/C}}\Big|F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big)\Big|.\end{aligned}$$

We concentrate on the inner sum. Using Lemmas 4.4 and 8.1 we see that the sum contributes

$$\begin{aligned}&\ll \frac{X}{BC}\#\Big\{a : F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) \asymp \frac{1}{B},\ \Big|S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big)\Big| \asymp \frac{X}{C}\Big\} \\ &\ll \frac{X(\log X)^{O_\eta(1)}}{BC}\min\Big(C^2,\ B^{235/154}X^{59/433}\Big) \\ &\ll_\eta X^{1+\epsilon}\frac{X^{59/866}}{B^{73/308}}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the bound $\min(x,y)\le x^{1/2}y^{1/2}$ in the last line. In particular, we see this is $O_\eta(X^{1-2\epsilon})$ if $B\gg X^{23/80}$ on verifying that $23/80\times 73/308>59/866$. Substituting this into our bound above gives the result. □

9. Exceptional minor arcs

In this section we reduce Proposition 6.4 to the task of establishing Proposition 9.3 and Proposition 9.4, given below. We do this by making use of the bilinear structure $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(n)$ which is supported on integers of the form n_1n_2 with n_1 of convenient size, and then showing that if these resulting bilinear expressions are large then the Fourier frequencies must lie in a smaller additively structured set. Propositions 9.3 and 9.4 then show that we have superior Fourier distributional estimates inside such sets. Thus we conclude that the bilinear sums are always small. To make the bilinear bound explicit, we establish the following lemma as an intermediate step.

Lemma 9.1 (Bilinear sum bound)**.** *Let $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{F}(Q,E)$ be given by*

$$\mathcal{F}=\Big\{a<X:\ \frac{a}{X}=\frac{b}{q}+\nu \text{ for some } (b,q)=1 \text{ with } q\asymp Q,\ \nu\asymp E/X\Big\}.$$

Then for any complex 1-bounded complex sequences $\alpha_n,\beta_m,\gamma_a$ we have

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}}\sum_{\substack{n\asymp N\\ m\asymp M}}F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\alpha_n\beta_m\gamma_a e\Big(\frac{-anm}{X}\Big)\ll\frac{X(\log X)^{O(1)}}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/100}},$$

provided $X^{9/25}\le N\le X^{17/40}$, $Q\ll X^{1/2}$, $NM\ll X$ and $E\ll X^{1/2}/Q$.

The key estimate constraining Fourier frequencies to additively structured sets is the following Lemma.

Lemma 9.2 (Geometry of numbers)**.** *Let K_0 be a sufficiently large constant, let $\mathbf{t}\in\mathbb{R}^3$ with $\|\mathbf{t}\|_2=1$ and let $N>1>\delta$. Let*

$$\mathcal{R}=\#\{\mathbf{v}\in\mathbb{R}^3:\ \|\mathbf{v}\|_2\le N,\ |\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{t}|\le\delta\}$$

satisfy $\#\mathcal{R}\cap\mathbb{Z}^3\ge\delta KN^2$ for some $K>K_0$. Then there exists a lattice $\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}^3$ of rank at most 2 such that

$$\#\{\mathbf{v}\in\Lambda\cap\mathcal{R}\}\gg\delta KN^2.$$

Proof. We define a norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathbf{t}}$ on $\mathbb{R}^3$ by $\|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{t}}^2:=\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2+(|\mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{t}|N/\delta)^2$. We choose a Minkowski basis $\{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2,\mathbf{v}_3\}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ with respect to this norm. (i.e. $\mathbf{v}_i$ is defined inductively as a vector $\mathbf{v}$ of minimal norm such that $\{\mathbf{v}_1,\dots,\mathbf{v}_{i-1},\mathbf{v}\}$ can be extended to a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}^3$.) Choosing $\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2,\mathbf{v}_3$ in this way ensures that $\{\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2,\mathbf{v}_3\}$ form a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathbb{Z}^3$ and that $\|\lambda_1\mathbf{v}_1+\lambda_2\mathbf{v}_2+\lambda_3\mathbf{v}_3\|_{\mathbf{t}}\asymp\sum_{i=1}^3|\lambda_i|\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_{\mathbf{t}}$ for any constants $\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\lambda_3\in\mathbb{R}$. From the definitions of $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathbf{v}_i$, we see that $\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_{\mathbf{t}}/N$ is within a multiplicative constant of the i^{th} successive minimum of $\mathcal{R}$. In particular, we have $\mathrm{vol}(\mathcal{R})\asymp\delta N^2\asymp\prod_{i=1}^3N/\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_{\mathbf{t}}$. Using these facts we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{R}\cap\mathbb{Z}^3&\subseteq\{\mathbf{v}\in\mathbb{Z}^3:\ \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbf{t}}\ll N\}\\&\subseteq\{\lambda_1\mathbf{v}_1+\lambda_2\mathbf{v}_2+\lambda_3\mathbf{v}_3:\ \lambda_i\in\mathbb{Z},|\lambda_i|\ll N/\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_{\mathbf{t}}\}.\end{aligned}$$

The number of elements in this last set with $\lambda_3 \neq 0$ is $\ll \prod_{i=1}^3 N/\|\mathbf{v}_i\|_{\mathbf{t}} \ll \delta N^2$ if $\|\mathbf{v}_3\|_{\mathbf{t}} \ll N$, and 0 otherwise. Since $\#\mathcal{R} \cap \mathbb{Z}^3 \geq \delta K N^2$ and K is sufficiently large, there must be at least $\delta K N^2/2$ vectors $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{R} \cap \mathbb{Z}$ of the form $\lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 + \lambda_2 \mathbf{v}_2$, and hence lying in a lattice of rank at most 2. □

Proposition 9.3 (Bound for angles generating lattices)**.** *Let $X^{17/40} \leq NK$, $\delta \gg N/X$ and $K \gg 1$. Let $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_1(N, K, \delta) \subseteq [1, X]^2$ be the set of pairs (a_1, a_2) such that there is a lattice $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^3$ of rank 2 such that*

$$\#\{\mathbf{n} \in \Lambda : |n_1 a_1 + n_2 a_2 + n_3| \leq \delta X, \|\mathbf{n}\|_2 \leq N\} \asymp \delta K N^2,$$

and not all of these points lie on a line $L \subseteq \Lambda$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(Q, E)$ be given by

$$\mathcal{F} = \Big\{a < X : \frac{a}{X} = \frac{b}{q} + \nu \text{ for some } (b, q) = 1 \text{ with } q \asymp Q,\ \nu \asymp E/X\Big\}.$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_1(N,K,\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big) F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll \frac{(\log X)^7}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/200}} \frac{X}{NK}.$$

Proposition 9.4 (Bound for angles generating lines)**.** *Let $N \gg X^{9/25}$, $\delta \gg N/X$ and $K \gg 1$. Let $\mathcal{B}_2 = \mathcal{B}_2(N, K, \delta) \subseteq [1, X]^2$ be the set of pairs (a_1, a_2) such that there is a line L such that*

$$\#\{\mathbf{n} \in L \cap \mathbb{Z}^3 : |n_1 a_1 + n_2 a_2 + n_3 X| \leq \delta X, \|\mathbf{n}\|_2 \leq N\} \gg \delta N^2 K.$$

Given $B \ll X^{23/80}$, let $\mathcal{E}' = \mathcal{E}'(B)$ be given by

$$\mathcal{E}' = \Big\{a < X : F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) \asymp \frac{1}{B}\Big\}.$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_2(N,K,\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{E}'}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big) F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll \frac{X^{1-\epsilon}}{NK}.$$

Proof of Proposition 6.4 and Lemma 9.1 assuming Propositions 9.3 and 9.4. By Dirichlet's theorem on Diophantine approximation, any $a \in [1, X]$ has a representation

$$\frac{a}{X} = \frac{b}{q} + \nu$$

for some integers $(b, q) = 1$ with $q \ll X^{1/2}$ and some real $\nu \ll 1/X^{1/2}Q$. Thus we can divide $[1, X]$ into $O(\log X)^2$ sets $\mathcal{F}(Q, E)$ as given by Proposition 9.3 for different parameters Q, E satisfying $1 \ll Q \ll X^{1/2}$ and $E = 0$ or $1/X \ll E \ll X^{1/2}/Q$. Moreover, if $a \notin \mathcal{M}$ then $a \in \mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(Q, E)$ for some Q, E, with $Q + E \gg (\log X)^C$. Thus, provided C is sufficiently large compared with A and η, we see it is sufficient to show that

$$\frac{1}{X} \sum_{a\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}} \Big|S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) S_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\frac{-a}{X}\Big)\Big| \ll \frac{(\log X)^{O_\eta(1)} \#\mathcal{A}}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/200}}.$$

From the shape of $\mathcal{R}$ given by the Lemma, we have that

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}}(n) = \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 p = n\\ X^{1-\delta} < p n_1 n_2 < X}} \Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_1}(n_1) \Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_2}(n) \log p,$$

where $\mathcal{R}_1$ is the projection of $\mathcal{R}$ onto the first ℓ_1 coordinates, and $\mathcal{R}_2$ is the projection onto the subsequent $\ell-\ell_1-1$ coordinates.

Let $-1/2<\tau\le 1/2$ be such that $\|X^{1-\delta}+\tau\|=1/2$. The conditions $X^{1-\delta}<n_1n_2p<X$ are then equivalent to $X^{1-\delta}+\tau<n_1n_2p<X-1/2$, with $n_1n_2p\in\mathbb{Z}$ always at least $1/2$ away from either endpoint (since $X\in\mathbb{Z}$). Thus, by Perron's formula, we have for $n_1,n_2,p<X$ that

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2}\int_{1/\log X-iX^3}^{1/\log X+iX^3}\int_{1/\log X-iX^3}^{1/\log X+iX^3}\Big(\frac{X^{1-\delta}+\tau}{n_1n_2p}\Big)^{s_1}\Big(\frac{n_1n_2p}{X-1/2}\Big)^{s_2}\frac{ds_1ds_2}{s_1s_2}$$
$$=\begin{cases}1+O(X^{-1}), & \text{if } X^{1-\delta}<n_1n_2p<X,\\ O(X^{-1}), & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

We recall from the Lemma that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_1}(n_1)=0$ unless $n_1\in[X^{9/25+\epsilon/2},X^{17/40-\epsilon/2}]$. Thus, letting $m=n_2p$ and $\mathcal{R}_2^+=\mathcal{R}_2\times[0,1]$, we see that it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}}S_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\sum_{n_1\asymp N}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_1}(n_1)n_1^{s_2-s_1}\sum_{m\asymp M}\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_2^+}(m)m^{s_2-s_1}e\Big(\frac{-an_1m}{X}\Big)$$
$$\ll\frac{(\log X)^{O_\eta(1)}\#\mathcal{A}}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/200}}$$

uniformly over all choices of $N\in[X^{9/25},X^{17/40}]$ and $M\ll X/N$ and uniformly over all complex numbers s_1,s_2 with $\Re(s_1)=\Re(s_2)=1/\log X$.

The only property of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_1}(n),\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_2^+}(m)$ that we will use from now on is that they are complex sequences bounded by $O(\log X)^\ell=(\log X)^{O_\eta(1)}$. Explicitly, let $\alpha_n=\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_1}(n)n^{s_2-s_1}/(\log X)^{\ell+1}$ and $\beta_m=\Lambda_{\mathcal{R}_2^+}(m)m^{s_2-s_1}/(\log X)^{\ell+1}$, and let γ_a satisfy $S_{\mathcal{A}}(a/X)=\#\mathcal{A}\gamma_aF_X(a/X)$. The complex sequences $\alpha_n,\beta_m,\gamma_a$ are then bounded by 1, and so we see that Proposition 6.4 follows from Lemma 9.1.

We split $\mathcal{E}$ into $O(\log X)$ subsets of the form

$$\mathcal{E}'=\mathcal{E}'(B)=\Big\{a\in[1,X]:\ F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\asymp\frac{1}{B}\Big\}$$

for some $B\in[1,X^{23/80}]$. By Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'}\sum_{\substack{n\asymp N\\ m\asymp M}}F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\alpha_n\beta_m\gamma_ae\Big(\frac{-anm}{X}\Big)\ll\Sigma_1^{1/2}\Sigma_2^{1/2},$$

where

$$\Sigma_1=\sum_{m\ll X/N}|\beta_m|^2\ll\frac{X}{N},$$

$$\Sigma_2=\sum_{m\ll X/N}\Big|\sum_{a\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'}\sum_{n\asymp N}\alpha_n\gamma_aF_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)e\Big(\frac{-anm}{X}\Big)\Big|^2$$
$$=\sum_{a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'}F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big)\sum_{n_1,n_2\asymp N}\alpha_{n_1}\overline{\alpha_{n_2}}\gamma_{a_1}\overline{\gamma_{a_2}}\sum_{m\ll X/N}e\Big(\frac{m(a_1n_1-a_2n_2)}{X}\Big)$$
$$\ll\sum_{a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'}F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big)\sum_{n_1,n_2\asymp N}\min\Big(\frac{X}{N},\Big\|\frac{a_1n_1-a_2n_2}{X}\Big\|^{-1}\Big).$$

Thus it suffices to show

$$\sum_{a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big)\sum_{n_1,n_2\asymp N}\min\Big(\frac{X}{N},\Big\|\frac{a_1n_1-a_2n_2}{X}\Big\|^{-1}\Big)\ll\frac{NX(\log X)^{O(1)}}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/100}},$$

provided $X^{9/25}\le N\le X^{17/40}$, $Q\ll X^{1/2}$ and $E\ll X^{1/2}/Q$.

Let $\mathcal{G}(K)$ denote the set of pairs $(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'$ such that

$$\sum_{n_1,n_2\ll N}\min\Big(\frac{X}{N},\Big\|\frac{n_1a_1-n_2a_2}{X}\Big\|^{-1}\Big)\asymp N^2K.$$

We consider $1\ll K\ll X/N$ in dyadic intervals and split the contribution of our sum according to these sets. We see it is therefore sufficient to show that for each K

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{G}(K)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big)\ll\frac{X(\log X)^{O(1)}}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/100}NK}.$$

Let $\mathcal{G}(K,\delta)$ denote the set of pairs $(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'$ such that

$$\#\Big\{\mathbf{n}\in\mathbb{Z}^3:\ \Big|\frac{n_1a_1-n_2a_2-n_3}{X}\Big|\le\delta,\ \|\mathbf{n}\|_2\ll N\Big\}\asymp\delta N^2K.$$

By considering $\delta=2^{-j}$ and using the pigeonhole principle, we see that if

$$\sum_{n_1,n_2\ll N}\min\Big(\frac{X}{N},\Big\|\frac{n_1a_1-n_2a_2}{X}\Big\|^{-1}\Big)\asymp N^2K$$

then there is some $\delta\gg N/X$ and some $K/\log X\ll K'\ll K$ such that

$$(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{G}(K',\delta).$$

Thus is suffices to show for all K,δ that

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{G}(K;\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}'}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big)\ll\frac{X(\log X)^{O(1)}}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/100}NK}. \tag{9.1}$$

From Lemma 8.2, we have the bound

$$\sum_{a_1\in\mathcal{E}'} F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big)\ll X^{23/80-\epsilon},$$

which gives (9.1) in the case when $NK\ll X^{17/40+\epsilon/2}$. Thus we may assume that $NK\gg X^{17/40+\epsilon/2}$. By assumption, we also have that $N\ll X^{17/40}$, so we only consider $K\gg X^{\epsilon/2}$. In particular, we may use Lemma 9.2 to conclude that either there is a rank 2 lattice $\Lambda\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^3$ such that

$$\#\{\mathbf{n}\in\Lambda:\ \|\mathbf{n}\|_2\ll N,\ |n_1a_1+n_2a_2+n_3|\le\delta X\}\gg\delta KN^2,$$

or there is a line $L\subseteq\mathbb{Z}^3$ such that

$$\#\{\mathbf{n}\in L:\ \|\mathbf{n}\|_2\ll N,\ |n_1a_1+n_2a_2+n_3|\le\delta X\}\gg\delta KN^2.$$

In either case (9.1) follows from Proposition 9.3 or Proposition 9.4. □

Thus it remains to establish Proposition 9.3 and Proposition 9.4.

10. Lattice Estimates

In this section we establish Proposition 9.3, which controls the contribution from pairs of angles which cause a large contribution to the bilinear sums considered in Section 9 to come from a lattice. A low height lattice Λ makes a significant contribution only if (a_1, a_2, X) is approximately orthogonal to the plane of the lattice, and only if (a_1, a_2, X) lies close to the line through the origin orthogonal to this lattice. We note that we only make small use of the fact that these angles lie in a small set, but it is vital that the angles lie outside the major arcs.

Lemma 10.1 (Lattice generating angles have simultaneous approximation)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}_1 = \mathcal{B}_1(N, K, \delta) \subseteq [1, X]^2$ be the set of pairs (a_1, a_2) such that there is a lattice $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^3$ of rank 2 such that*

$$\#\{\mathbf{n} \in \Lambda : |n_1a_1 + n_2a_2 + n_3| \leq \delta X, \|\mathbf{n}\|_2 \leq N\} \asymp \delta KN^2,$$

for some quantities δ, K with $\delta \gg N/X$ and $K \gg 1$. Moreover, assume that the points counted above do not all lie on a line $L \subseteq \Lambda$.

Then all pairs $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ have the simultaneous rational approximations

$$\frac{a_1}{X} = \frac{b_1}{q} + O\Big(\frac{1}{NKq}\Big),$$
$$\frac{a_2}{X} = \frac{b_2}{q} + O\Big(\frac{1}{NKq}\Big).$$

for some integer $q \leq X/NK$.

Proof. Given vectors $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $V = \|\mathbf{v}\|_2$, $W = \|\mathbf{w}\|_2$ and $\|\mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{w}\|_2 \asymp VW$ and reals $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 > 0$, the set of $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $|\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{t}| \leq \epsilon_1$ and $|\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{t}| \leq \epsilon_2$ is contained in an infinite cuboid with axis parallel to $\mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{w}$, and side lengths ϵ_1/V and ϵ_2/W. (Here $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the standard Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^3$ and $\wedge$ is the exterior or cross product on $\mathbb{R}^3$.) Explicitly, if $\{\mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2, \mathbf{t}_3\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^3$ with $\mathbf{t}_1$ orthogonal to both $\mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{w}$ and with $\mathbf{t}_2$ orthogonal to $\mathbf{v}$, then the set of such $\mathbf{t}$ is contained in the set

$$\{\lambda_1\mathbf{t}_1 + \lambda_2\mathbf{t}_2 + \lambda_3\mathbf{t}_3 : (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3, |\lambda_3| \ll \epsilon_1/V, |\lambda_2 + c\lambda_3| \ll \epsilon_2/W\}$$

for some constant $c \ll 1$. (Since $\|\mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{w}\|_2/VW \asymp 1$ all implied constants are absolute.) In particular, if $\mathbf{a} = (a_1/X, a_2/X, 1)$ satisfies $|\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{a}| \leq \epsilon_1$ and $|\mathbf{w} \cdot \mathbf{a}| \leq \epsilon_2$ for $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \leq \epsilon$, then

$$\Big\|\begin{pmatrix} a_1/X \\ a_2/X\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} c_1/c_3 \\ c_2/c_3\end{pmatrix}\Big\|_2 \ll \frac{\epsilon_1}{V} + \frac{\epsilon_2}{W}, \tag{10.1}$$

where c_1, c_2, c_3 are the components of $\mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{w}$.

Any rank 2 lattice Λ has a Minkowski basis $\{\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}\}$ over $\mathbb{Z}$. If $\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = V$ and $\|\mathbf{w}\|_2 = W$ then $\|\mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{w}\|_2 \asymp VW$. It follows that we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\#\{\mathbf{n} \in \Lambda : |\mathbf{n} \cdot \mathbf{a}| \leq \delta, \|\mathbf{n}\|_2 \leq N\}\\ &\leq \#\Big\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |\lambda_1| \ll \frac{N}{V}, |\lambda_2| \ll \frac{N}{W}, |\lambda_1\epsilon_1 + \lambda_2\epsilon_2| \leq \delta\Big\}\\ &\ll \min\Big(\frac{N^2}{VW}, \frac{N\delta}{V\epsilon_2}, \frac{N\delta}{W\epsilon_1}\Big),\end{aligned} \tag{10.2}$$

provided both $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}$ lie in the first set. (i.e. $V, W \ll N$ and $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 \ll \delta$).

By assumption of the Lemma, for any pair $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ there is a rank 2 lattice Λ_{a_1,a_2} such that

$$\#\{\mathbf{n} \in \Lambda : |n_1 a_1 + n_2 a_2 + n_3| \leq \delta X, \|\mathbf{n}\|_2 \leq N\} \gg \delta K N^2,$$

and not all the points lie in a line $L \subseteq \Lambda$. Thus, by (10.1) and (10.2), for any $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ there are some vectors $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ such that

$$\Big\| \begin{pmatrix} a_1/X \\ a_2/X \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} c_1/c_3 \\ c_2/c_3 \end{pmatrix} \Big\|_2 \ll \frac{\epsilon_1}{V} + \frac{\epsilon_2}{W}$$

and

$$\delta K N^2 \ll \min\Big(\frac{N^2}{VW}, \frac{N\delta}{V\epsilon_2}, \frac{N\delta}{W\epsilon_1}\Big),$$

where $\epsilon_1 = |\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{v}|$, $\epsilon_2 = |\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{w}|$, $V = \|\mathbf{v}\|_2$, $W = \|\mathbf{w}\|_2$ and $c_1, c_2, c_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$ are the components of $\mathbf{v} \wedge \mathbf{w}$. In particular, there are integers $c_1, c_2, c_3 \ll VW$ such that

$$\Big\| \begin{pmatrix} a_1/X \\ a_2/X \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} c_1/c_3 \\ c_2/c_3 \end{pmatrix} \Big\|_2 \ll \frac{1}{NKVW}. \tag{10.3}$$

Moreover, $VW \ll 1/\delta K \ll X/NK$. This gives the result. □

Proof of Proposition 9.3. We wish to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1(N,K,\delta) \\ a_1,a_2 \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{E}}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big) F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll \frac{(\log X)^7}{(Q+E)^{\epsilon/100}} \frac{X}{NK}.$$

in the region $X^{17/40} \leq NK$. By Lemma 10.1 we are considering the contribution from pairs (a_1, a_2) such that

$$\frac{a_1}{X} = \frac{b_1}{q} + \nu_1,$$
$$\frac{a_2}{X} = \frac{b_2}{q} + \nu_2.$$

for some $q \ll X/NK$ and $\nu_1, \nu_2 \ll 1/NKq$. This restricts the pair (a_1, a_2) to lie in a set of size $O(X/NK)^3$, which is noticeably smaller that X^2 for the range of NK under consideration. This allows us to obtain superior bounds for the sum over a_1, a_2, by exploiting the estimates of Lemma 4.6 which show F is not abnormally large on such a set.

By clearing common factors we may assume that $(b_1, b_2, q) = 1$. We let $g_1 = (b_1, q)$ and $g_2 = (b_2, q)$. By symmetry we may assume that $g_1 \leq g_2$. We let d_1 be the part of g_1 not coprime to 10 (i.e. $d_1 | 10^u$ for some integer u, and $g_1 = g_1' d_1$ for some $(g_1', 10) = 1$). Similarly we let d_0 be the part of $q/g_1 g_2$ which is not coprime to 10. To ease notation we let $b_1' = b_1/g_1$, $b_2' = b_2/g_2$, $q' = q/g_1 g_2 d_0$ and $g_1' = g_1/d_1$. Thus $q = g_1' g_2 d_0 d_1 q'$, $b_1 = b_1' d_1 g_1'$ and $b_2 = b_2' g_2$ with $(b_1', q' g_2 d_0) = (b_2', q' g_2 d_0) = 1$ and $(q', 10) = (g_1', 10) = 1$.

We split the contribution of pairs $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ into $O(\log X)^7$ subsets. We consider terms where we have the restrictions $q' \asymp Q_1$, $g_1' \asymp G_1$, $g_2 \asymp G_2$, $d_0 \asymp D_0$ and $d_1 \asymp D_1$ for some $Q_1, G_1, G_2, D_0, D_1 \geq 1$ all integer powers of 10 with $Q_0 := Q_1 G_1 G_2 D_0 D_1 \ll X/NK$. We further restrict to $\nu_1 \asymp E_1/X$, $\nu_2 \asymp E_2/X$ for some

$1/X \ll E_1, E_2 \ll X/NKq$ or to $\nu_1, \nu_2 \ll 1/X$. We deal with the case $E_1, E_2 \gg 1$; the case of $E_1 \leq 1$ or $E_2 \leq 1$ is identical with E_1 or E_2 replaced by 1 throughout. We see there are $O(\log X)^7$ sets with such restrictions which cover all possible $(b_1, b_2, q, \nu_1, \nu_2)$ and hence all $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1$. For simplicity, the reader might like to consider the special case $G_1 = G_2 = D_0 = D_1 = 1$ on a first reading.

To ease notation we let $\mathcal{V} = \{2^u 5^v : u, v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$. By summing over all possibilities of $q', g_1', g_2, d_0, d_1, b_1', b_2'$, we see that

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_1(N,K,\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll (\log X)^7 \sup_{\substack{Q_1,G_1,G_2\\ D_0,D_1,E_1,E_2}} \sum_{\substack{d_0,d_1\in\mathcal{V}\\ d_0\asymp D_0\\ d_1\asymp D_1}} S_1S_2,$$

where

$$S_1 = \sup_{\substack{q'\asymp Q_1\\ (q',10)=1}} \sum_{\substack{g_1'\asymp G_1\\ (g_1',10)=1}} \sum_{\substack{0<b_1'<d_0d_1q'g_1'\\ (b_1',d_0d_1q'g_1')=1}} \sum_{\substack{\nu_1\ll E_1/X\\ X(b_1'/d_0d_1q'g_1'+\nu_1)\in\mathbb{Z}}} F_X\Big(\frac{b_1'}{d_0d_1q'g_1'}+\nu_1\Big),$$

$$S_2 = \sum_{\substack{q'\asymp Q_1\\ g_2\asymp G_2}} \sum_{\substack{0<b_2'<d_0q'g_2\\ (b_2',d_0q'g_2)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\nu_2\ll E_2/X\\ X(b_2'/d_0q'g_2+\nu_2)\in\mathbb{Z}}} F_X\Big(\frac{b_2'}{d_0q'g_2}+\nu_2\Big).$$

In the case when Q_0 is large it is wasteful to sum over all these possibilities. Instead we first sum over all $a_2 \in \mathcal{E}$, then all possibilities of q. This shows that

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_1(N,K,\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll (\log X)^7 \sup_{\substack{Q_1,G_1,G_2\\ D_0,D_1,E_1,E_2}} \sum_{\substack{d_0,d_1\in\mathcal{V}\\ d_0\asymp D_0\\ d_1\asymp D_1}} S_1S_3,$$

where S_1 is as given above and S_3 is given by

$$S_3 = \sum_{a_2\in\mathcal{E}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big)\#\Big\{q'\asymp Q_1 : \exists b_2, g_2 \text{ s.t. } \frac{a_2}{X} = \frac{b_2}{q'd_0g_2} + O(E_2/X)\Big\}.$$

Here it is assumed that b_2, g_2 satisfy $g_2 \asymp G_2$ and $(b_2, d_0q'g_2) = 1$. If $d_0g'q'$ and $d_0g''q''$ are two possible denominators for a_2 counted above, then there exists b', b'' such that $(b', q'd_0g') = (b'', q''d_0g'') = 1$ and

$$\frac{a_2}{X} = \frac{b'}{q'd_0g'} + O\Big(\frac{1}{NKQ_0}\Big) = \frac{b''}{q''d_0g''} + O\Big(\frac{1}{NKQ_0}\Big).$$

In particular, we see that

$$b'q''g'' - b''q'g' \ll \frac{Q_0}{D_0D_1NK}.$$

Thus, by the divisor bound, there are $O(1 + Q_0^{1+\epsilon}/D_0D_1NK)$ different possible denominators for any given a_2 (since $(b', q'g') = 1$). Combining this with Lemma (8.2) gives the bound

$$S_3 \ll X^{23/80} + \frac{Q_0^{1+\epsilon}X^{23/80}}{D_0D_1NK}. \tag{10.4}$$

We wish to show that $\min(S_1S_2, S_3S_2) \ll Q_0^{1-2\epsilon}(E_1E_2)^{1/2-\epsilon}$, where we recall $Q_0 = Q_1G_1G_2D_0D_1$ is the approximate size of q. By Lemma 4.6 we have

$$S_1 \ll (E_1D_0D_1Q_1G_1^2)^{27/77} \ll \frac{E_1^{27/77}Q_0^{27/77}G_1^{27/77}}{G_2^{27/77}}, \tag{10.5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &\ll (E_2D_0Q_1^2G_2^2)^{27/77} + \frac{Q_1^2G_2^2E_2D_0}{X^{50/77}} \\ &\ll \frac{E_2^{27/77}Q_0^{54/77}}{G_1^{54/77}D_0^{27/77}D_1^{54/77}} + \frac{Q_0^2E_2}{X^{50/77}D_0D_1G_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.6}$$

Alternatively, we may bound S_1 using Lemma 4.7, which gives

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &\ll (D_0D_1E_1)^{27/77}(Q_1G_1^2)^{1/21} + \frac{Q_1G_1^2(D_0D_1)^{3/2}E_1^{5/6}}{X^{10/21}}\Big) \\ &\ll Q_0^{1/21}(D_0D_1E_1)^{27/77} + \frac{Q_0G_1(D_0D_1)^{1/2}E_1^{5/6}}{G_2X^{10/21}}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.7}$$

If the first term in (10.7) dominates, then since $E_1, E_2 \ll X/NKQ_0$, the bounds (10.7) and (10.6) give

$$\begin{aligned} S_1S_2 &\ll (E_1E_2)^{27/77}Q_0^{54/77+1/21} + \frac{Q_0^{2+1/21}E_1E_2}{X^{50/77}} \\ &\ll Q_0^{1-2\epsilon}(E_1E_2)^{1/2-\epsilon}\Big(1 + \frac{1}{X^{50/77}}\Big(\frac{X}{NK}\Big)^{1+1/21+2\epsilon}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

This shows $S_1S_2 \ll Q_0^{1-2\epsilon}(E_1E_2)^{1/2-\epsilon}$ in this case by recalling that $NK \gg X^{17/40}$ and verifying that $22/21 \times 23/40 < 50/77$.

If instead the second term in (10.7) dominates, then by (10.5) and (10.7) (using $G_1 \le G_2$ and replacing $E_1^{5/6}$ with E_1 to simplify the expression), we have

$$S_1 \ll \min\Big(E_1^{27/77}Q_0^{27/77}, \frac{Q_0E_1(D_0D_1)^{1/2}}{X^{10/21}}\Big). \tag{10.8}$$

Combining this with (10.6) to eliminate D_0D_1 factors, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_1S_2 &\ll \frac{Q_0E_1}{X^{10/21}}\frac{Q_0^2E_2}{X^{50/77}} + \frac{(Q_0^2E_2)^{27/77}}{(D_0D_1)^{27/77}}\Big((E_1Q_0)^{27/77}\Big)^{1/3}\Big(\frac{Q_0E_1(D_0D_1)^{1/2}}{X^{10/21}}\Big)^{2/3} \\ &\ll \frac{Q_0^3E_1E_2}{X^{9/8}} + \frac{E_2^{1/2}E_1^{4/5}Q_0^{6/7}}{X^{3/10}}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.9}$$

Here we have simplified the exponents appearing for an upper bound. We recall that $E_1 \ll X/NKQ_0$ and (by assumption of the Lemma) $NK \gg X^{17/40}$. These give

$$\frac{E_2^{1/2}E_1^{4/5}Q_0^{6/7}}{X^{3/10}} \ll E_1^{1/2}E_2^{1/2}Q_0\frac{(X^{23/40})^{3/10}}{X^{3/10}}.$$

Thus this term is $O(Q_0(E_1E_2)^{1/2}/X^{2\epsilon})$.

Similarly, we find that combining (10.8) and (10.4) gives

$$S_1S_3 \ll (XE_1Q_0)^{27/77} + \frac{Q_0^2E_1}{X^{3/16}NK}. \tag{10.10}$$

Here we used $10/21-23/80>3/16$. Combining (10.9) and (10.10), we obtain

$$\min(S_1S_2, S_1S_3) \ll \frac{Q_0(E_1E_2)^{1/2}}{X^{2\epsilon}} + \min\Big((Q_0XE_2)^{27/77} + \frac{Q_0^2E_1}{X^{3/16}NK}, \frac{Q_0^3E_1E_2}{X^{9/8}}\Big).$$

We find that

$$\min\Big((Q_0XE_2)^{27/77}, \frac{Q_0^3E_1E_2}{X^{9/8}}\Big) \ll (Q_0XE_2)^{27/102}\Big(\frac{Q_0^3E_1E_2}{X^{9/8}}\Big)^{25/102} \ll \frac{Q_0E_1E_2}{X^{1/100}},$$

and, since $NK \gg X^{17/40} \gg X^{13/32+\epsilon}$, that

$$\frac{Q_0^2E_1}{X^{3/16}NK} \ll Q_0\frac{X^{13/16}}{(NK)^2} \ll Q_0^{1-2\epsilon}.$$

Thus we have $\min(S_1S_2, S_3S_2) \ll Q_0^{1-2\epsilon}(E_1E_2)^{1/2-\epsilon}$ in all cases, as desired.

There are $O(Q_0^{o(1)})$ elements $d_3, d_4 \in \mathcal{V}$ with $d_3, d_4 \ll Q_0$, and so putting this all together we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_1(N,K,\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll (\log X)^7Q_0^{1-\epsilon}(E_1E_2)^{1/2-\epsilon} \ll \frac{(\log X)^7X}{(Q_0E_1E_2)^{\epsilon}NK},$$

by using the fact $E_1Q_0, E_2Q_0 \ll X/NK$.

We see that if $Q_0+E_1+E_2 \gg X^{1/50}$, this gives a bound

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_1(N,K,\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{F}\cap\mathcal{E}}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll \frac{X^{1-\epsilon/50}}{NK}$$

This gives the result in this case since $Q+E \ll X^{1/2}$. We recall that $(a_1,a_2)\subseteq\mathcal{F}^2$ where

$$\mathcal{F} = \Big\{a<X:\ \frac{a}{X} = \frac{b'}{q'}+\nu \text{ for some } q'\asymp Q,\ (b,q')=1,\ |\nu|\asymp\frac{E}{X}\Big\}.$$

for some $Q\ll X^{1/2}$ and $E\ll X^{1/2}/Q$. We then see that if $Q_0+E_1+E_2\ll X^{1/50}$ we must have $Q\ll Q_0$ and $E\ll\min(E_1,E_2)$. This then gives the result. □

11. Line Estimates

In this section we establish Proposition 9.4, which controls the contribution from pairs of angles which cause a large contribution to the bilinear sums considered in Section 9 to come from a line. If a line L makes a large contribution, then (a_1,a_2,X) must lie close to the low height plane orthogonal to this line. We note that we do not make use of the fact that these angles lie outside the major arcs, but it is vital that the angles are restricted to the small set $\mathcal{E}$.

Lemma 11.1 (Line angles lie in low height plane)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}_2=\mathcal{B}_2(N,K,\delta)$ be the set of pairs $(a_1,a_2)\in[1,X]^2$ such that there is a line L such that*

$$\#\{\mathbf{n}\in L\cap\mathbb{Z}^3 : |n_1a_1+n_2a_2+n_3X|\le\delta X,\ \|\mathbf{n}\|_2\le N\}\gg\delta N^2K$$

for some quantities δ, K with $\delta\gg N/X$ and $K\gg 1$.

Then all pairs $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{B}_2$ satisfy

$$v_1 a_1 + v_2 a_2 + v_3 X + v_4 = 0$$

for some integers $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \ll X/N^2K$ not all zero.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ be a smallest element of $\mathbb{Z}^3 \cap L$, and let $V = \|\mathbf{v}\|_2$, $\epsilon_1 = |a_1 v_1 + a_2 v_2 + a_3 X|$. Then all of $\mathbb{Z}^3 \cap L$ is generated by $\mathbf{v}$, and so

$$\#\{\mathbf{n} \in L \cap \mathbb{Z}^3 : |n_1 a_1 + n_2 a_2 + n_3 X| \le \delta X,\ \|\mathbf{n}\|_2 \le N\} \ll \min\Big(\frac{N}{V}, \frac{\delta X}{\epsilon_1}\Big).$$

By assumption, this is also $\gg \delta N^2 K$, and so we obtain

$$V \ll \frac{1}{NK\delta} \ll \frac{X}{N^2K}, \qquad \epsilon_1 \ll \frac{X}{N^2K}.$$

Letting $v_4 = \pm\epsilon_1$ gives the result. □

Lemma 11.2 (Sparse sets restricted to low height planes)**.** *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq [1, X)$ be a set of integers. Then we have for any $V \ge 1$*

$$\#\Big\{(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{C}^2 : \exists (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) \in [-V, V]^4 \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\} \text{ s.t. } v_1 a_1 + v_2 a_2 + v_3 X + v_4 = 0\Big\}$$
$$\ll X^{o(1)}\Big(\#\mathcal{C}^{5/4}V^2 + \#\mathcal{C}^{3/2}V + \frac{\#\mathcal{C}^{3/2}V^3}{X^{1/2}}\Big).$$

Proof. By the divisor bound, there are

$$O(\#\mathcal{C}V^2 X^{o(1)}) \tag{11.1}$$

choices of $(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, a_1, a_2)$ satisfying $v_1 a_1 + v_2 a_2 + v_3 X + v_4 = 0$ with at least one of v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 equal to 0 (and at least one of v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 non-zero). There are $O(\#\mathcal{C})$ pairs $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{C}^2$ with $a_1 = 0$ or $a_2 = 0$. Thus it suffices to consider pairs (a_1, a_2) with $a_1, a_2, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \ne 0$. We let $\mathcal{C}_2$ denote the set of such pairs.

Given $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, let M_a be the smallest value of $(c_1^2 + c_2^2)^{1/2}$ over all non-zero integers c_1, c_2 such that $c_1 \equiv c_2 X \pmod a$. We divide $\mathcal{C}$ into $O(\log X)^2$ dyadic regions for the size of a and M_a by considering the sets

$$\mathcal{C}(A, M) = \{a \in \mathcal{C} :\ a \in [A, 2A), M_a \in [M, 2M)\}.$$

There are $O(M^2)$ choices of c_1, c_2 with $(c_1^2 + c_2^2)^{1/2} \ll M$, and given any such choice with $M < X/2$ there are $X^{o(1)}$ choices of $a | c_1 - c_2 X$ from the divisor bound (noting that this must be non-zero). Thus we have that

$$\#\mathcal{C}(A, M) \le X^{o(1)} \min(\#\mathcal{C}, M^2).$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz we have

$$\sum_{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{C}_2} 1 \ll X^{o(1)} \#\mathcal{C}^{1/2} \sup_{A,M} \Big(\sum_{a_1 < X} \Big(\sum_{a_2 \in \mathcal{C}(A,M)} 1\Big)\Big)^{1/2}$$
$$\le X^{o(1)} \#\mathcal{C}^{1/2} \sup_{A,M} N_2^{1/2}, \tag{11.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}N_2 &= \#\Big\{(a,a')\in\mathcal{C}(A,M)^2 : \exists v_i,v_i' \text{ s.t. } \frac{v_2a}{v_1X}+\frac{v_3}{v_1}+\frac{v_4}{v_1X}=\frac{v_2'a'}{v_1'X}+\frac{v_3'}{v_1'}+\frac{v_4'}{v_1'X},\\ &\qquad v_1,v_1'\in[V_1,2V_1],\ 0<|v_2|,|v_2'|,|v_3|,|v_3'|,|v_4|,|v_4'|\ll V\Big\}\\ &\le \#\Big\{(a,a')\in\mathcal{C}(A,M)^2 :\ \exists v_i,v_i' \text{ s.t. } v_2v_1'a-v_2'v_1a'+(v_3v_1'-v_1v_3')X\ll V^2,\\ &\qquad (v_1,v_1')=1,\ v_1,v_1',v_2,v_2',v_3,v_3'\ll V,\ v_1v_1'v_2v_2'\neq 0\Big\}\\ &\le \#\Big\{(a,a',b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4):\ b_1a+b_2a'+b_3X+b_4=0, a,a'\in\mathcal{C}(A,M),\\ &\qquad (b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4)=1,\ b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4\ll V^2,\ b_1b_2\neq 0\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$b_3=-\frac{b_1a+b_2a'+b_4}{X}\ll\frac{V^2A}{X}.$$

We make a choice of a,a',b_1, for which there are $\ll V^2X^{o(1)}\min(M^4,\#\mathcal{C}^2)$ possibilities counted by N_2. We see that b_3,b_4 satisfy

$$b_3X+b_4\equiv b_1a \pmod{a'}.$$

Let $b_{3,0},b_{4,0}$ be a solution to this congruence with $b_{3,0}^2+b_{4,0}^2$ minimal. We may assume that $b_{3,0},b_{4,0}\ll V^2$ since otherwise there are no possible b_3,b_4. All pairs b_3,b_4 satisfying the congruence are then of the form $(b_3,b_4)=(b_{3,0}+b_3',b_{4,0}+b_4')$ for some integers b_3',b_4' satisfying $b_3'X+b_4'\equiv 0 \pmod{a'}$. This forces b_3',b_4' to lie in a lattice $\Lambda\subset\mathbb{Z}^2$ of determinant a'. Any such lattice has a basis $\mathbf{v}_1,\mathbf{v}_2$ such that $\|\mathbf{v}_1\|_2\|\mathbf{v}_2\|_2\asymp\det(\Lambda)=a'\asymp A$ and $\|\lambda_1\mathbf{v}_1+\lambda_2\mathbf{v}_2\|_2\asymp|\lambda_1|\|\mathbf{v}_1\|_2+|\lambda_2|\|\mathbf{v}_2\|_2$. From the definition of M_a, we see that the smallest vector in this lattice has length $\gg M$. Thus the number of vectors (b_3',b_4') in Λ and inside the bounded region $|b_3'|\ll V^2A/X$, $|b_4'|\ll V^2$ is

$$\ll 1+\frac{V^2}{M}+\frac{1}{a'}\frac{AV^4}{X}\ll 1+\frac{V^2}{M}+\frac{V^4}{X}.$$

Given any choice of b_3,b_4, we see that b_2 is then determined uniquely by $b_1a+b_2a'=b_3X+b_4$. Putting this all together, we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned}N_2&\ll X^{o(1)}V^2\min(M^4,\#\mathcal{C}^2)\Big(1+\frac{V^2}{M}+\frac{V^4}{X}\Big)\\ &\ll\Big(\#\mathcal{C}^2V^2+\#\mathcal{C}^{3/2}V^4+\frac{\#\mathcal{C}^2V^6}{X}\Big)X^{o(1)}.\end{aligned}$$

We substitute this into (11.2) and obtain

$$\sum_{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{C}_2}1\ll X^{o(1)}\Big(\#\mathcal{C}^{3/2}V+\#\mathcal{C}^{5/4}V^2+\frac{\#\mathcal{C}^{3/2}V^3}{X^{1/2}}\Big).$$

We recall from (11.1) that terms with $v_1v_2v_3v_4a_1a_2=0$ contribute a total $O(V^2\#\mathcal{C})$, which is negligible compared with the $\#\mathcal{C}^{5/4}V^2$ term above. Thus we obtain the result. □

We see that Lemma 11.2 improves on the trivial bound $O(\min(V^{3+o(1)}\#\mathcal{C},\#\mathcal{C}^2))$ if $V^{8/3+\epsilon}\ll\#\mathcal{C}\ll V^{4-\epsilon}+X^{1-\epsilon}$.

Proof of Proposition 9.4. We wish to show that

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_2(N,K,\delta)\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{E}'}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll \frac{X^{1-\epsilon}}{NK}.$$

in the region $N \gg X^{9/25}$. We recall that

$$\mathcal{E}' = \Big\{a < X : F_X\Big(\frac{a}{X}\Big) \asymp \frac{1}{B}\Big\} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$$

for some $B \ll X^{23/80}$. We have that

$$\sum_{a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{E}'} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll \frac{(\#\mathcal{E}')^2}{B^2}.$$

By Lemma 4.4, we have

$$\#\mathcal{E}' \ll B^{235/154}X^{59/433}. \tag{11.3}$$

This gives

$$\sum_{a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{E}'} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll B^{81/77}X^{118/433} \ll BX^{23/80-\epsilon}$$

on verifying that $4/77 \times 23/80 + 118/433 < 23/80$. This gives the required bound if $NK \ll X^{57/80}/B$.

Alternatively, if $NK \gg X^{57/80}/B$, we use Lemmas 11.1 and 11.2 to bound $\#(\mathcal{B}_2 \cap (\mathcal{E}')^2)$, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_2} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) &\ll \frac{\#(\mathcal{B}_2\cap(\mathcal{E}')^2)}{B^2}\\ &\ll \frac{1}{B^2}\#\Big\{a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{E}' : \exists \mathbf{v}\in\mathbb{Z}^4\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\} \text{ s.t. } \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \ll \frac{X}{N^2K}, \mathbf{v}\cdot\mathbf{a}=0\Big\}\\ &\ll \frac{X^{o(1)}}{B^2}\Big((\#\mathcal{E}')^{5/4}\Big(\frac{X}{N^2K}\Big)^2 + (\#\mathcal{E}')^{3/2}\frac{X}{N^2K} + \frac{(\#\mathcal{E}')^{3/2}}{X^{1/2}}\Big(\frac{X}{N^2K}\Big)^3\Big). \qquad (11.4)\end{aligned}$$

Here we have written $\mathbf{a}$ for the vector $(a_1, a_2, X, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$.

Since $NK \gg X^{57/80}/B$, we have $X/NK \ll X^{23/80}B$. Combining this bound with (11.3), we obtain a bounds for $(\#\mathcal{E}')^{5/4}X/(NKB^2)$ and $(\#\mathcal{E}')^{3/2}B^{-2}$ of the form X^aB^b for some $b > 0$. Since we are only considering $B \ll X^{23/80}$, these expressions are maximized when $B \asymp X^{23/80}$. When $B \asymp X^{23/80}$ we have $\#\mathcal{E}' \ll X^{23/40}$ and $X/NK \ll X^{23/40}$. Thus we obtain the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(\#\mathcal{E}')^{5/4}}{B^2}\frac{X}{NK} &\ll X^{115/160} = X^{23/32},\\ \frac{(\#\mathcal{E}')^{3/2}}{B^2} &\ll X^{23/80},\\ \frac{(\#\mathcal{E}')^{3/2}}{B^2X^{1/2}}\Big(\frac{X}{NK}\Big)^2 &\ll X^{75/80} = X^{15/16}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these bounds into (11.4) gives

$$\sum_{\substack{(a_1,a_2)\in\mathcal{B}_2\\ a_1,a_2\in\mathcal{E}'}} F_X\Big(\frac{a_1}{X}\Big)F_X\Big(\frac{a_2}{X}\Big) \ll \Big(\frac{X^{23/32}}{N^2}+\frac{X^{23/80}}{N}+\frac{X^{15/16}}{N^3}\Big)\frac{X^{1+o(1)}}{NK}.$$

We can then verify that $15/16 < 3\times 9/25$, that $23/32 < 2\times 9/25$ and that $23/80 < 9/25$, so for $N \gg X^{9/25}$ this is $O(X^{1-\epsilon}/NK)$, as required. □

12. Sieve Asymptotics

In this section we use our Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 6.1 along with the 'fundamental lemma' of sieve methods to deduce Proposition 12.1 given below, which asymptotically evaluates various sieve terms.

We recall that given a polytope $\mathcal{R}\subseteq\mathbb{R}^\ell$, we have

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(a)=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } a=p_1\dots p_\ell \text{ with } \Big(\frac{\log p_1}{\log X},\dots,\frac{\log p_\ell}{\log X}\Big)\in\mathcal{R},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

that $\mathcal{B}=\{n\in\mathbb{Z}:\ 1\le n<X\}$, and that for a set $\mathcal{C}$ we define

$$\mathcal{C}_d=\{c:\ cd\in\mathcal{C}\}$$
$$S(\mathcal{C},z)=\{c\in\mathcal{C}:\ p|c\Rightarrow p>z\}.$$

Proposition 12.1 (Sieve asymptotic terms). *Let $\mathcal{R}\subseteq[\epsilon,1]^\ell$ be a convex polytope in $\mathbb{R}^\ell$ for some $\ell\ll 1$ which is independent of X, and let $\theta\le 17/40-9/25-4\epsilon$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{d<X^{50/77-\epsilon}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(d)\Big(S(\mathcal{A}_d,X^\theta)-\kappa_2\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}S(\mathcal{B}_d,X^\theta)\Big)=o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big),$$

where

$$\kappa_2=\begin{cases}\frac{10(\phi(10)-1)}{9\phi(10)}, & \text{if } (10,a_0)=1,\\ \frac{10}{9}, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

We first prove establish an auxiliary lemma before proving Proposition 12.1.

Lemma 12.2 (Fundamental Lemma). *Let $\mathcal{B}=\{n<X\}$. Given a set $\mathcal{C}$, let*

$$\#\mathcal{C}_d=\{a<X:\ ad\in\mathcal{C}\}.$$

Then we have for $\delta>0$

$$\sum_{\substack{d<X^{50/77-\epsilon}\\ p|d\Rightarrow p>X^\delta}}\Big|S(\mathcal{A}_d,X^\delta)-\kappa_2\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{X}S(\mathcal{B}_d,X^\delta)\Big|\ll\frac{\exp(-\delta^{-2/3})}{\log X}\#\mathcal{A}.$$

The implied constant is independent of δ.

Proof. It suffices to assume $\delta\le\epsilon/4$ since the result for $\delta>\epsilon/4$ follows from the result for $\delta=\epsilon/4$ on noting $S(\mathcal{B}_d,X^\delta)\ll\delta^{-1}X/d\log X$. Let

$$\mathcal{A}'=\{a\in\mathcal{A}:\ (a,10)=1\}.$$

Then $\#\mathcal{A}' = \kappa\#\mathcal{A}$, and by Proposition 5.1 we have for $(e,10)=1$ that

$$\#\{a \in \mathcal{A}'_d : e|a\} = \frac{\kappa\#\mathcal{A}}{de} + O(R_d(e)),$$

where, putting $q = de$, the error terms $R_d(e)$ satisfy

$$\sum_{\substack{d<X^{50/77-\epsilon}\\ p|d\Rightarrow p>X^\delta}} \sum_{\substack{e<X^{\epsilon/2}\\ (e,10)=1\\ p|e\Rightarrow p<X^\delta}} R_d(e) \ll \sum_{\substack{q<X^{50/77-\epsilon/2}\\ (q,10)=1}} \Big|\#\mathcal{A}'_q - \frac{\kappa\#\mathcal{A}}{q}\Big|$$

$$\ll \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{(\log X)^A}. \tag{12.1}$$

By the fundamental lemma of sieve methods (see, for example, [12, Theorem 6.9]) and the bound (12.1) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{d<X^{50/77-\epsilon}\\ p|d\Rightarrow p>X^\delta}} \Big|S(\mathcal{A}'_d, X^\delta) - \frac{\kappa\#\mathcal{A}}{d} \prod_{\substack{p<X^\delta\\ p\nmid 10}} \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\Big|$$

$$\ll \exp(-\delta^{-1+\epsilon}) \prod_{\substack{p<X^\delta\\ p\nmid 10}} \Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\#\mathcal{A} \sum_{\substack{d<X^{50/77-\epsilon}\\ p|d\Rightarrow p>X^\delta}} \frac{1}{d}. \tag{12.2}$$

The product in the final bound is $O(\delta^{-1}(\log X)^{-1})$, and the inner sum over d is seen to be $O(\delta^{-1})$ by an Euler product upper bound.

An identical argument works for the set $\mathcal{B}' = \{n < X : (n,10) = 1\}$ instead of $\mathcal{A}'$. We see that for $(d,10)=1$ we have $S(\mathcal{A}'_d, X^\delta) = S(\mathcal{A}_d, X^\delta)$, that $S(\mathcal{B}'_d, X^\delta) = S(\mathcal{B}_d, X^\delta)$, and that $\#\mathcal{B}' = \phi(10)\#\mathcal{B}/10$. Taking the weighted difference of these expressions, and noting the main terms cancel, we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{d<X^{50/77-\epsilon}\\ p|d\Rightarrow p>X^\delta}} \Big|S(\mathcal{A}_d, X^\delta) - \frac{10\kappa\#\mathcal{A}}{\phi(10)X} S(\mathcal{B}_d, X^\delta)\Big| \ll \frac{\exp(-\delta^{-2/3})}{\log X}\#\mathcal{A}. \qquad \square$$

Using Lemma 12.2 we can now prove Proposition 12.1, assuming Proposition 6.1.

Proof of Proposition 12.1. Let $\theta_1 = 9/25 + 2\epsilon$, $\theta_2 = 17/40 - 2\epsilon$ and $\theta \le \theta_2 - \theta_1$. We first consider the contribution from $d \le X^{\theta_1}$. We let $\mathcal{D} = \{d : d \le X^{\theta_1}, \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(d) \ne 0\}$.

Given a set $\mathcal{C}$ and an integer d, we let

$$T_m(\mathcal{C}; d) = \sum_{\substack{X^\delta < p_m \le \cdots \le p_1 \le X^\theta\\ dp_1\dots p_m \le X^{\theta_1}}} S(\mathcal{C}_{p_1\dots p_m}, X^\delta),$$

$$U_m(\mathcal{C}; d) = \sum_{\substack{X^\delta < p_m \le \cdots \le p_1 \le X^\theta\\ dp_1\dots p_m \le X^{\theta_1}}} S(\mathcal{C}_{p_1\dots p_m}, p_m),$$

$$V_m(\mathcal{C}; d) = \sum_{\substack{X^\delta < p_m \le \cdots \le p_1 \le X^\theta\\ X^{\theta_1} < dp_1\dots p_m \le X^{\theta_2}}} S(\mathcal{C}_{p_1\dots p_m}, p_m).$$

Buchstab's identity shows that

$$U_m(\mathcal{C};d)=T_m(\mathcal{C};d)-U_{m+1}(\mathcal{C};d)-V_{m+1}(\mathcal{C};d).$$

We define $T_0(\mathcal{C};d)=S(\mathcal{C};X^\delta)$ and $V_0(\mathcal{C};d)=0$. This gives

$$S(\mathcal{C},X^\theta)=T_0(\mathcal{C};d)-V_1(\mathcal{C};d)-U_1(\mathcal{C};d)=\sum_{m\geq 0}(-1)^m(T_m(\mathcal{C};d)+V_m(\mathcal{C};d)).$$

We apply the above decomposition to $\mathcal{A}_d$. This gives an expression with $O(\delta^{-1})$ terms since trivially $T_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)=U_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)=V_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)=0$ if $m>\theta_2/\delta$. Applying the same decomposition to $\mathcal{B}_d$, taking the weighted difference, and summing over $d\in\mathcal{D}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}S(\mathcal{A}_d,X^\theta)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}S(\mathcal{B}_d,X^\theta)&\\ \ll\sum_{0\leq m\ll 1/\delta}\Big|\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}\Big(T_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}T_m(\mathcal{B}_d;d)\Big)\Big|&\\ +\sum_{0\leq m\ll 1/\delta}\Big|\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}\Big(V_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}V_m(\mathcal{B}_d;d)\Big)\Big|.&\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 12.2, if δ is small compared with ϵ, we have

$$\sum_{m\ll 1/\delta}\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}\Big|T_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}T_m(\mathcal{B};d)\Big|\ll\frac{\delta^{-1}\exp(-\delta^{-2/3})\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}.$$

We see that there are $O(1)$ convex polytopes $\mathcal{R}$ each contained in $[\delta,1]^\ell$ for some $\ell\ll 1/\delta$ such that

$$\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}\Big(V_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}V_m(\mathcal{B};d)\Big)=\sum_{\mathcal{R}}\Big(\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(a)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{n<X}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{R}}(n)\Big),$$

and moreover for each $\mathcal{R}$ there is an $\ell_1\leq\ell$ such that the sum of first ℓ_1 coordinates (corresponding to $dp_1\dots p_m$) of any element $\mathbf{e}$ of $\mathcal{R}$ satisfies $\sum_{i=1}^{\ell_1}e_i\in[\theta_1,\theta_2]$. Thus, by Proposition 6.1 we have

$$\sum_{m\ll\delta^{-1}}\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}\Big(V_m(\mathcal{A}_d;d)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}V_m(\mathcal{B};d)\Big)=O_\delta\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X\log\log X}\Big).$$

Putting this together, we obtain

$$\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}S(\mathcal{A}_d,X^\theta)-\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{X}\sum_{d\in\mathcal{D}}S(\mathcal{B}_d,X^\theta)\ll\Big(\exp(-\delta^{-1/2})+o_\delta(1)\Big)\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}.$$

Letting $\delta\to 0$ sufficiently slowly then gives the result for $d<X^{\theta_1}$.

The contribution from d with $X^{\theta_2}\leq d\leq X^{50/77-\epsilon}$ can be handled by an identical argument, where instead of restricting to $dp_1\dots p_m\leq X^{\theta_1}$ or $X^{\theta_1}<dp_1\dots p_m\leq X^{\theta_2}$ in T_m, U_m and V_m, we instead restrict to $dp_1\dots p_m\leq X^{1-\theta_2}$ or $X^{1-\theta_2}<dp_1\dots p_m\leq X^{1-\theta_1}$. If $a\in\mathcal{A}_{dp_1\dots p_m}$ with $X^{1-\theta_2}<dp_1\dots p_m\leq X^{1-\theta_1}$ then $a=a_1a_2$ with $a_1=dp_1\dots p_m\in[X^{1-\theta_2},X^{1-\theta_1}]$ so either $a\ll X^{1-\epsilon}$ (which gives a negligble contribution) or $a_2\in[X^{\theta_1-\epsilon},X^{\theta_2+\epsilon}]$, which means such sums can also be handed by our Type II estimates. Here we have used the fact that $50/77>1-17/40$, so the terms corresponding to T_m can still be bounded by Lemma 12.2.

The contribution from d with $X^{\theta_1} < d \le X^{\theta_2}$ is negligible automatically by Proposition 6.1. This gives the result. □

13. Sieve Decomposition and proof of Theorem 1.1

Finally, we prove Theorem 1.1. We make a decomposition of $\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\}$ into various terms following Harman's sieve (see [14] for more details). Each of these terms can then be asymptotically estimated by Proposition 6.1 or Proposition 12.1, or can be trivially bounded below by 0. To keep track of the terms in this decomposition we apply the same decomposition to the set $\mathcal{B} = \{n < X\}$ by considering a weighted sequence $\mathcal{W}$.

Let w_n be weights supported on integers $n < X$ given by

$$w_n = \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n) - \frac{\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}}{X} \ge -\frac{\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}}{X}.$$

(We recall that $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the indicator function of $\mathcal{A}$.) Given an integer $d > 0$ and a real number $z > 0$, let

$$S(\mathcal{W}_d, z) = \sum_{\substack{n < X/d \\ p|n \Rightarrow p > z}} w_{nd} = S(\mathcal{A}_d, z) - \frac{\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}}{X} S(\mathcal{B}_d, z).$$

We expect that $S(\mathcal{W}_d, z)$ is typically small for a wide range of d and z. In this notation, Proposition 12.1 and Proposition 6.1 give the following two results.

Proposition 13.1 (Sieve asymptotic terms, alternate formulation)**.** *Let $\theta_1 = 9/25 + 2\epsilon$, $\theta_2 = 17/40 - 2\epsilon$ and $\theta_3 = 50/77 - \epsilon$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be a set of $O(1)$ affine linear functions $L_i : \mathbb{R}^\ell \to \mathbb{R}$. Then we have*

$$\sum^*_{\substack{X^{\theta_2-\theta_1} \le p_1 \le \cdots \le p_\ell \\ p_1 \dots p_\ell \le X^{\theta_3}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{p_1 \dots p_\ell}, X^{\theta_2-\theta_1}) = o_{\mathcal{L}}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big),$$

where $\sum^*$ indicates the summation is restricted by the conditions

$$L\Big(\frac{\log p_1}{\log X}, \dots, \frac{\log p_\ell}{\log X}\Big) \ge 0$$

for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$.

Proposition 13.2 (Type II terms, alternate formulation)**.** *Let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \mathcal{L}$ be as in Proposition 13.1, and let $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \dots, \ell\}$.*

$$\sum^*_{\substack{X^{\theta_2-\theta_1} \le p_1 \le \cdots \le p_\ell \\ X^{\theta_1} \le \prod_{j \in \mathcal{J}} p_j \le X^{\theta_2}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{p_1 \dots p_\ell}, p_1) = o_{\mathcal{L}}\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big),$$

where $\sum^*$ indicates the same restriction of summation to $L \ge 0$ for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$ as Proposition 13.1.

Proposition 13.1 includes the case $\ell = 0$, where we interpret the statement as

$$S(\mathcal{W}, X^{\theta_2-\theta_1}) = o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big). \tag{13.1}$$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The upper bound for Theorem 1.1 follows from Proposition 5.1 by a standard sieve upper bound, and can be seen immediately from (13.1). Thus it suffices to establish the lower bound.

To simplify notation, we let $z_1 \le z_2 \le z_3 \le z_4 \le z_5 \le z_6 \le z_7$ be given by

$$z_1 = X^{\theta_2-\theta_1}, \qquad z_2 = X^{\theta_1}, \qquad z_3 = X^{\theta_2}, \qquad z_4 = X^{1/2},$$
$$z_5 = X^{1-\theta_2}, \qquad z_6 = X^{1-\theta_1}, \qquad z_7 = X^{\theta_3}.$$

By the prime number theorem, we have

$$\#\{p \in \mathcal{A}\} = \#\{p \in \mathcal{A} : \, p > X^{1/2}\} + O(X^{1/2}) = S(\mathcal{W}, z_4) + (1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}.$$

Thus we wish to bound $S(\mathcal{W}, z_4)$ from below. By Buchstab's identity

$$S(\mathcal{W}, z_4) = S(\mathcal{W}, z_1) - \sum_{z_1 < p \le z_4} S(\mathcal{W}_p, p).$$

The term $S(\mathcal{W}, z_1)$ is $o(\#\mathcal{A}/\log X)$ by Proposition 13.1. We split the sum over p into ranges $[z_i, z_{i+1}]$, and see that all the terms with $p \in [z_2, z_3]$ are also negligible by Proposition 13.2. This gives

$$S(\mathcal{W}, z_4) = -\sum_{z_1 < p \le z_2} S(\mathcal{W}_p, p) - \sum_{z_3 < p \le z_4} S(\mathcal{W}_p, p) + o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big).$$

For $\delta = 1/(\log X)^{1/2}$, by the prime number theorem and Proposition 13.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\le \sum_{p < X^{1/2}} \Big(S(\mathcal{A}_p, \min(p, (X/p)^{1/2})) - S(\mathcal{A}_p, p)\Big) \\ &\le \sum_{p < X^{1/2-\delta}} \sum_{\substack{(X/p)^{1/2} < q \le p \\ qp \in \mathcal{A}}} 1 + \sum_{X^{1/2-\delta} \le p \le X^{1/2}} S(\mathcal{A}_p, z_1) \\ &\ll \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{A} \\ a < X^{1-\delta}}} 1 + \frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} \sum_{X^{1/2-\delta} \le p < X^{1/2}} \frac{1}{p} = o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{13.2}$$

Similarly, we get corresponding bounds for $S(\mathcal{B}_p, \min(p, (X/p)^{1/2}))$, and so we can replace $S(\mathcal{W}_p, p)$ with $S(\mathcal{W}_p, \min(p, (X/p)^{1/2}))$ at the cost of a small error. Thus, applying Buchstab's identity again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{W}, z_4) = &-\sum_{z_1 < p \le z_2} S(\mathcal{W}_p, z_1) - \sum_{z_3 < p \le z_4} S(\mathcal{W}_p, z_1) + \sum_{\substack{z_1 < q \le p \le z_2 \\ q < (X/p)^{1/2}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq}, q) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{z_3 < p \le z_4 \\ z_1 < q < (X/p)^{1/2}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq}, q) + o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms here are asymptotically negligible by Proposition 13.1. We perform further decompositions to the final terms. Splitting the ranges of pq into intervals, and recalling those with a factor in the interval $[z_2, z_3]$ or $[z_5, z_6]$ make a

negligible contribution, we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q<(X/p)^{1/2}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) = \sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ z_6\le pq}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) + \sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ z_3\le pq<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) + \sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ z_1\le pq<z_2}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) + o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big).$$

On recalling the definition of $\mathcal{W}$, we can lower bound the first term by dropping the non-negative contribution from the set $\mathcal{A}$ via $w_n \ge -\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}/X$. By partial summation, this gives

$$\sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ z_6<pq}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) \ge -(1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} \iint_{\substack{\theta_2-\theta_1<v<u<\theta_1\\ v<(1-u)/2\\ 1-\theta_1<u+v}} \omega\Big(\frac{1-u-v}{v}\Big)\frac{dudv}{uv^2}. \tag{13.3}$$

Here $\omega(u)$ is Buchstab's function, defined on $u \ge 1$ by $\omega(u) = 1/u$ for $1 \le u \le 2$ and $\omega'(u) = \omega(u-1) - \omega(u)$ for $u > 2$.

We perform further decompositions to the second term, first splitting according to the size of q^2p compared with z_7.

$$\sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ z_3\le pq<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) = \sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3\le pq<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) + \sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ z_7\le q^2p<X\\ z_3\le pq<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q).$$

When q^2p is large we drop the contribution from $\mathcal{A}$ for a lower bound, giving

$$\sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ z_7\le q^2p<X\\ z_3\le pq<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q) \ge -(1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} \iint_{\substack{\theta_2-\theta_1<v<u<\theta_1\\ \theta_3<2v+u<1\\ \theta_2<u+v<1-\theta_2}} \omega\Big(\frac{1-u-v}{v}\Big)\frac{dudv}{uv^2}. \tag{13.4}$$

When $q^2p < z_7$ we can apply two further Buchstab iterations. Similarly to (13.2), we may replace $S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q)$ by $S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},(X/pq)^{1/2})$ if $q > (X/pq)^{1/2}$ and $S(\mathcal{W}_{pqr},r)$ with $S(\mathcal{W}_{pqr},(X/pqr)^{1/2})$ if $r > (X/pqr)^{1/2}$ at the cost of negligible error terms.

This gives

$$\sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3\le pq<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q)=\sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3\le pq<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},z_1)-\sum_{\substack{z_1<r\le q\le p\le z_2\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3\le pq<z_5\\ r<(X/pq)^{1/2}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pqr},r)+o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big)$$

$$=o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big)-\sum_{\substack{z_1<r\le q\le p\le z_2\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3\le pq<z_5\\ r<(X/pq)^{1/2}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pqr},z_1)+\sum_{\substack{z_1<s\le r\le q\le p\le z_2\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3\le pq<z_5\\ r^2pq,s^2rpq<X}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pqrs},s)$$

$$=o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big)+\sum_{\substack{z_1<s\le r\le q\le p\le z_2\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3\le pq<z_5\\ r^2pq,s^2pqr<X}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pqrs},s)$$

$$\ge -(1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\iiiint\limits_{(u,v,w,t)\in\mathcal{R}_1}\omega\Big(\frac{1-u-v-w-t}{w}\Big)\frac{dudvdwdt}{uvwt^2}, \tag{13.5}$$

where r,s are restricted to primes in the sums above, and where $\mathcal{R}_1$ is given by

$$\mathcal{R}_1=\Big\{(u,v,w,t):\theta_2-\theta_1<t<w<v<u<\theta_1,\ u+2v<\theta_3, u+v+2w<1,$$
$$u+v+w+2t<1,\ \theta_2<u+v<1-\theta_2,$$
$$\{u+v,u+w,u+t,v+w,v+t,w+t\}\cap[\theta_1,\theta_2]=\emptyset\Big\}.$$

We note that we could impose various further restrictions such as $u+v+w\notin[\theta_1,\theta_2]$ in $\mathcal{R}_1$, but for ease of calculation we do not include these. Here we have used Proposition 13.1 and Proposition 13.2 to bound intermediate terms as before.

We perform decompositions to the third term in a similar way to how we dealt with the second term. We have $q^2p<(qp)^{3/2}<z_2^{3/2}<z_7$, so we can apply two Buchstab iterations giving

$$\sum_{\substack{z_1<q\le p\le z_2\\ z_1\le pq<z_2}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq},q)=o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big)+\sum_{\substack{z_1<s<r<q<p<z_2\\ z_1<pq<z_2}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pqrs},s)$$

$$\ge -(1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\iiiint\limits_{(u,v,w,t)\in\mathcal{R}_2}\omega\Big(\frac{1-u-v-w-t}{t}\Big)\frac{dudvdwdt}{uvwt^2}, \tag{13.6}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_2=\Big\{(u,v,w,t):\theta_2-\theta_1<t<w<v<u<\theta_1,\ u+v<\theta_1,$$
$$u+v+w+t\notin[\theta_1,\theta_2]\cup[1-\theta_2,1-\theta_1],$$
$$\{u+v+w,u+v+t,u+w+t,v+w+t\}\cap[\theta_1,\theta_2]=\emptyset\Big\}.$$

We note that for $\mathcal{R}_2$ we have dropped different constraints to those we dropped in $\mathcal{R}_1$.

This gives our full decomposition for the terms with $p\le z_2$. We treat the remaining terms with $p\in[z_3,z_4]$ in an analogous manner. We split the sum according to the

whether qp lies in $[z_3, z_5]$ or not, and then split the terms with $qp \in [z_3, z_5]$ according to the size of q^2p compared with z_7. This gives

$$\sum_{\substack{z_3<p\le z_4\\ z_1<q<(X/p)^{1/2}}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq}, q) = S_1 + S_2 + S_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{\substack{z_3<p\le z_4\\ z_1<q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ z_6<qp}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq}, q)\\ &\ge -(1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} \iint_{\substack{\theta_2<u<1/2\\ \theta_2-\theta_1<v<(1-u)/2\\ 1-\theta_1<u+v}} \omega\Big(\frac{1-u-v}{v}\Big)\frac{dudv}{uv^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{13.7}$$

and where

$$\begin{aligned} S_2 &= \sum_{\substack{z_3<p\le z_4\\ z_1<q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ z_7<q^2p<X\\ z_3<qp<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq}, q)\\ &\ge -(1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} \iint_{\substack{\theta_2<u<1/2\\ \theta_2-\theta_1<v<(1-u)/2\\ \theta_3<2v+u<1\\ \theta_2<u+v<1-\theta_2}} \omega\Big(\frac{1-u-v}{v}\Big)\frac{dudv}{uv^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{13.8}$$

Finally, applying two further Buchstab iterations we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 &= \sum_{\substack{z_3<p\le z_4\\ z_1<q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3<qp<z_5}} S(\mathcal{W}_{pq}, q)\\ &= \sum_{\substack{z_3<p<z_4\\ z_1<s<r<q<(X/p)^{1/2}\\ q^2p<z_7\\ z_3<qp<z_5\\ s^2qrp, r^2qp<X}} S(\mathcal{W}_{p,q,r,s}, s) + o\Big(\frac{\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}\Big)\\ &\ge -(1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2 \#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} \iiiint_{(u,v,w,t)\in\mathcal{R}_3} \omega\Big(\frac{1-u-v-w-t}{t}\Big)\frac{dudvdwdt}{uvwt^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{13.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_3 = \Big\{&(u,v,w,t) : \theta_2-\theta_1 < t < w < v,\ \theta_2 < u < 1/2,\ u+2v < \theta_3,\\ &u+v+2w<1,\ u+v+w+2t<1,\ \theta_2 < u+v < 1-\theta_2,\\ &\{u+v, u+w, u+t, v+w, v+t, w+t\} \notin [\theta_1, \theta_2]\Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $I_1, \dots, I_7$ denote the integrals in (13.3), (13.4), (13.5), (13.6), (13.7), (13.8) and (13.9) respectively. Putting this all together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\#\{p\in\mathcal{A}\} &= (1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X} + S(\mathcal{W}, X^{1/2})\\ &\geq (1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{\log X}(1-I_1-I_2-I_3-I_4-I_5-I_6-I_7).\end{aligned}$$

In particular, we have

$$\#\{p\in\mathcal{A}\} \geq (1+o(1))\frac{\kappa_2\#\mathcal{A}}{100\log X} \tag{13.10}$$

provided that $I_1+\cdots+I_7\leq 0.99$. Numerical integration[3] then gives the following bounds on $I_1,\dots,I_7$ in the case when $\theta_1 = 9/25 = 0.36$, $\theta_2 = 17/40 = 0.425$, $\theta_3 = 50/77 = 0.6493...$

$$\begin{aligned} &I_1 \leq 0.02895, && I_2 \leq 0.42583,\\ &I_3 \leq 0.06810, && I_4 \leq 0.06622,\\ &I_5 \leq 0.21879, && I_6 \leq 0.14998,\\ &I_7 \leq 0.01303.\end{aligned}$$

Thus in this case we have $I_1+\cdots+I_7 < 0.971$, and so by continuity we have $I_1+\cdots+I_7 < 0.971+O(\epsilon)$ when $\theta_1 = 9/25+2\epsilon$, $\theta_2 = 17/40-2\epsilon$, $\theta_3 = 50/77-\epsilon$. Thus, taking ϵ suitably small, we see that (13.10) holds, and so we have completed the proof of Theorem 1.1. □

We note that there are various ways in which one can improve the numerical estimates, but we have restricted ourselves to the above decomposition in the interests of clarity. Employing further Buchstab decompositions or incorporating a 'reversal of roles' as in [13] would give improvements, for example.

14. Modifications for Theorem 1.2

Theorem 1.2 follows from essentially the same overall approach as in Theorem 1.1. We only provide a brief sketch the proof, leaving the complete details to the interested reader. When q is large, there is negligible benefit from using the $235/154^{th}$ moment, so we just use ℓ^1 bounds. For $Y = q^k$ a power of q, we let

$$F_Y(\theta) = Y^{-\log(q+s)/\log q}\Big|\sum_{n<Y}\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(n)e(n\theta)\Big| = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\frac{1}{q-s}\Big|\sum_{\substack{n_i<q\\ n_i\notin\mathcal{B}}}e(n_iq^i\theta)\Big|.$$

The inner sum is $\ll \min(q-s,\, s+2/\|q^i\theta\|)$. Thus, similarly to Lemma 4.3, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t<Y}F_Y\Big(\frac{t}{Y}\Big) &\ll \frac{1}{(q-s)^k}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\Big|\sum_{t_i<q}\min\Big(q-s, \frac{q}{t_i}+\frac{q}{q-t_i}+s\Big)\Big|\\ &= O\Big(\frac{q\log q+qs}{q-s}\Big)^k. \end{aligned}\tag{14.1}$$

[3] A Mathematica® file detailing this computation is included with this article on `arxiv.org`.

In particular, for q large enough in terms of ϵ and $s \leq q^{23/80}$, this is $O(Y^{23/80+\epsilon})$. We can use this bound in place of Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 throughout the argument with the same (or stronger) consequences. This gives the first part of Theorem 1.2.

For the second part of Theorem 1.2, we see that in the special case $\mathcal{B} = \{0, \dots, s-1\}$ we have

$$\Big|\sum_{\substack{n_i<q\\ n_i\notin\mathcal{B}}} e(n_i\theta)\Big| = \Big|\frac{e((q-s)\theta)-1}{e(\theta)-1}\Big| \leq \min\Big(q-s, \frac{2}{\|\theta\|}\Big).$$

Using this bound, get a corresponding improvement on (14.1), which gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{t<Y} F_Y\Big(\frac{t}{Y}\Big) &\ll \frac{1}{(q-s)^k}\prod_{i=0}^{k-1}\sum_{t_i<q}\min\Big(q-s, \frac{q}{t}+\frac{q}{q-t}\Big)\\ &= O\Big(\frac{q\log q+q-s}{q-s}\Big)^k. \qquad (14.2)\end{aligned}$$

If $s \leq q - q^{57/80}$ and q is sufficiently large in terms of ϵ, this gives a bound $Y^{23/80+\epsilon}$. As before, using this bound in place of Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 throughout gives the result.

For the results mentioned after Theorem 1.2, we find that in the further restricted ranges $s \leq q^{1/4-\delta}$ (or $s \leq q - q^{3/4+\delta}$ if $\mathcal{B} = \{0, \dots, s-1\}$), the bound (14.1) (or (14.2)) give an ℓ^1 bound of $Y^{1/4-\delta/2}$. Following this through the argument, we obtain a wider Type II range and can estimate bilinear sums provided $N \in [X^{5/16}, X^{1/2}]$ instead of $[X^{9/25}, X^{17/40}]$. By symmetry, we can then also estimate terms in $N \in [X^{1/2}, X^{11/16}]$. This allows us to obtain asymptotic estimates for all the terms in the right hand side of the identity

$$S(\mathcal{A}, X^{1/2}) = S(\mathcal{A}, X^{3/8-2\epsilon}) - \sum_{X^{3/8-2\epsilon}\leq p<X^{1/2}} S(\mathcal{A}_p, p),$$

by the equivalents of Proposition 13.1 and Proposition 13.2 adapted to this larger Type II range.

15. Acknowledgments

We thank Ben Green for introducing the author to this problem and Xuancheng Shao for useful discussions. The author is supported by a Clay Research Fellowship and a Fellowship by Examination of Magdalen College, Oxford. Part of this work was performed whilst the author was visiting Stanford university, whose hospitality is gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] William D. Banks, Alessandro Conflitti, and Igor E. Shparlinski. Character sums over integers with restricted g-ary digits. *Illinois J. Math.*, 46(3):819–836, 2002.

[2] William D. Banks and Igor E. Shparlinski. Arithmetic properties of numbers with restricted digits. *Acta Arith.*, 112(4):313–332, 2004.

[3] Jean Bourgain. Prescribing the binary digits of primes, II. *Israel J. Math.*, 206(1):165–182, 2015.

[4] Sylvain Col. Diviseurs des nombres ellipséphiques. *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 58(1):1–23, 2009.

[5] Jean Coquet. On the uniform distribution modulo one of some subsequences of polynomial sequences. *J. Number Theory*, 10(3):291–296, 1978.
[6] Jean Coquet. On the uniform distribution modulo one of subsequences of polynomial sequences. II. *J. Number Theory*, 12(2):244–250, 1980.
[7] Cécile Dartyge and Christian Mauduit. Nombres presque premiers dont l'écriture en base r ne comporte pas certains chiffres. *J. Number Theory*, 81(2):270–291, 2000.
[8] Cécile Dartyge and Christian Mauduit. Ensembles de densité nulle contenant des entiers possédant au plus deux facteurs premiers. *J. Number Theory*, 91(2):230–255, 2001.
[9] Michael Drmota and Christian Mauduit. Weyl sums over integers with affine digit restrictions. *J. Number Theory*, 130(11):2404–2427, 2010.
[10] Paul Erdős, Christian Mauduit, and András Sárközy. On arithmetic properties of integers with missing digits. I. Distribution in residue classes. *J. Number Theory*, 70(2):99–120, 1998.
[11] Paul Erdős, Christian Mauduit, and András Sárközy. On arithmetic properties of integers with missing digits. II. Prime factors. *Discrete Math.*, 200(1-3):149–164, 1999. Paul Erdős memorial collection.
[12] John Friedlander and Henryk Iwaniec. *Opera de cribro*, volume 57 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
[13] G. Harman. On the distribution of αp modulo one. II. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 72(2):241–260, 1996.
[14] G. Harman. *Prime-detecting sieves*, volume 33 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007.
[15] Sergei Konyagin. Arithmetic properties of integers with missing digits: distribution in residue classes. *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 42(1-2):145–162, 2001.
[16] Christian Mauduit and Joël Rivat. Sur un problème de Gelfond: la somme des chiffres des nombres premiers. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 171(3):1591–1646, 2010.

Magdalen College, Oxford, England, OX1 4AU

E-mail address: james.alexander.maynard@gmail.com